DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 155 SO 014 663

AUTHOR Herriott, Robert E.; Firestone, William A.
TITLE Multisite Qualitative Policy Research in Education: A Study of Recent Federal Experience. Final Report.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC. Educational Policy and Organization Program.
PUB DATE Dec 82
CONTRACT 400-80-0019
NOTE 130p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Data Analysis; *Educational Policy; *Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Federal Programs; *Generalization; *Reliability; *Research Methodology; Research Needs; Social Science Research
IDENTIFIERS *Qualitative Studies

ABSTRACT

A comparison of multisite educational research projects involving qualitative research methods is reported. In phase 1 of the project, telephone interviews with key staff members of 25 projects determined ways in which each project handled important qualitative design and implementation choices. Phase 2 consisted of a more intensive study of 5 projects: the Rural Experimental Schools Study, Experience-Based Career Education, Career Intern Program, Parental Involvement Study, and Dissemination Efforts Supporting School Improvement. Extensive interviews with key project members determined the project history, the interests of project staff and relevant outsiders, and methodological and administrative dilemmas characteristic of policy research. Telephone interviews were conducted with federal officials who monitored each project. Differences in the degree to which the methodologies of these projects were formalized were substantial. Formalization entails codification of questions and variables, standardization of data collection methods, and systematic reduction of verbal narrative to codes and categories. The variation results from different adaptations of social science to policy research and is more a function of the professional preferences of the research team than of the technical requirements of policy research or the desires of those who commissioned it. Appendices include profiles of the 25 multisite studies, tables, and an annotated bibliography. (Author/KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED228155

MULTISITE QUALITATIVE POLICY RESEARCH IN EDUCATION:

A STUDY OF RECENT FEDERAL EXPERIENCE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Final Report
Contract No. 400-80-0019

Prepared by

Robert E. Herriott
William A. Firestone

85 Jennie Dugan Road
Concord, MA 01742

December 1982

SP041663

This report has been prepared with support from School Management and Organizational Studies, a unit of the Program on Educational Policy and Organization, National Institute of Education under contract No. 400-80-0019. It does not, however, necessarily reflect the view of that agency.

MULTISITE QUALITATIVE POLICY RESEARCH IN EDUCATION:
A STUDY OF RECENT FEDERAL EXPERIENCE

(Contract No. 400-80-0019)

Abstract

The last decade has seen the emergence in the policy arena of a new form of qualitative research, one intended to strenghten its ability to generalize while preserving in-depth description. These multisite qualitative studies address the same research question using similar data collection and analysis procedures in a number of settings.

To gain systematic knowledge about this phenomenon a study was undertaken of policy research projects in the field of education that were: 1) federally funded via a competitive RFP process, 2) involved the application of qualitative methods of data collection and 3) compared several research sites. Telephone interviews were conducted with a key staff member of 25 such projects to learn how each project handled important qualitative design and implementation choices. Subsequently a more intensive study of five projects was carried out to explore those choices in greater detail. Key documents from each project were reviewed prior to extensive interviews with project staff members at their offices. The interviews focused on the natural history of each project, the interests of project staff and relevant outsiders, and methodological and administrative dilemmas characteristic of policy research. Later, telephone interviews were conducted with federal officials who monitored each project.

One important distinction among these mulitisite qualitative studies was the degree to which their methodology was "formalized." Formalization entails codification of the questions and variables to be studied, standardization of the data collection methods, and systematic reduction of verbal narrative to codes and categories. The variation in formalization observed across projects was substantial and seemed to result from different adaptations of academic social science to the policy research context. Such variation was more a function of the professional preferences and behavior of the research team than of the technical requirements of policy research or the desires of those who commissioned it.

CONTENTS

	Page
Abstract	iii
Acknowlegements	vii
PART I	
INTRODUCTION	3
The Generalizability Issue	3
The Reliability Issue	6
Overview of the Remainder of this Report	7
References	9
PART II	
MULTISITE QUALITATIVE RESEARCH: OPTOMIZING DESCRIPTION AND GENERALIZABILITY	13
Historical Context	15
The Rural Experimental Schools Study	18
A Survey of Multisite Qualitative Studies	21
Four Design Issues	21
Inter-issue Patterns	24
The Future of Multisite Qualitative Research	26
Notes	30
References	31

PART III

THE FORMALIZATION OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH:
AN ADAPTATION OF "SOFT" SCIENCE TO THE POLICY WORLD . . . 37

A Study of Multisite Studies 40

Formalization in Qualitative Research 44

Alternative Explanations for Variation in Formalization . 49

Technical Requirements 50

The Contractual Relationship 52

Professional Factors 59

Discussion 70

Notes 77

References 79

PART IV -- APPENDICES

A. Profiles of 25 Multisite Qualitative Studies 85

B. Explanatory Notes for the Project Profiles 115

C. Supplementary Tables for Part II 121

D. Annotated Bibliography for Part III 129

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report has been prepared with support from School Management and Organizational Studies, a unit of the Program on Educational Policy and Organization, National Institute of Education. It does not, however, necessarily reflect the view of that agency.

We owe a special debt of gratitude to Fritz Mulhauser of the Institute's staff for facilitating this research through his role as its federal project monitor. His direct experience with several multisite qualitative studies, in conjunctions with his more informal knowledge of many others, led him to recognize early the potential value to both policy researchers and their sponsors of learning about the range of federal experience with this emergent research form. Although this study was a small part of his professional responsibilities during its life, he gave to it an extraordinary degree of intellectual and administrative energy, and for this we are most grateful.

The many policy researchers and federal officials who gave generously of their time as informants about the phenomenon under study also warrant recognition. Particularly important to the success of our endeavor were those associated with the five projects examined in Part III, each of whom was most helpful in providing documentary materials and interview data. Our colleague, Judith A. Dawson of Research for Better Schools, helped with the collection and analysis of those data and made an important contribution to our use of them in understanding the phenomenon of multisite qualitative studies.

Concord, Massachusetts
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Robert E. Herriott
William A. Firestone

December 1982

PART I

INTRODUCTION

The tremendous growth of social programs in the 1960s led to even greater growth in the sponsorship of research about them in the 1970s. Initially, federally funded policy research concentrated on program outcomes, but gradually an expansion occurred to include an interest in program processes and implementation. Associated with this broadening of interest was a shift from the use of research designs that were exclusively quantitative to those that mixed quantitative and qualitative techniques and even to ones that were exclusively qualitative. Within the field of education this shift in research approach occurred in two phases. The earliest studies simply applied to multiple research sites qualitative approaches that had been developed within academia for the study of a single site. This was done in efforts to enhance generalizability without sacrificing in-depth description. In later studies, qualitative methods from academia were subjected to much modification as efforts were made to enhance their reliability.

THE GENERALIZABILITY ISSUE

After an initial attraction to qualitative approaches in their most highly developed academic form--that of anthropological ethnography--sponsors and researchers began to question the applicability of traditional ethnography to formal program evaluations. A congressional aide, who later became an official at the National Institute of Education (NIE), reflected

on the early experiences of that agency with the sponsorship of multisite ethnographic studies and openly questioned their relevance to the immediate needs of policy makers (see Mulhauser, 1975). However, an experience ethnographer, who was serving as an advisor to one of NIE's contractors, argued that ethnography would lose its credibility as a form of scholarship if it attempted to be evaluative (see Wolcott, 1975).

Concurrently, quantitative researchers questioned early efforts to generalize from qualitative studies (e.g., see Campbell, 1974). Their concern was with the larger domain, if any, to which the findings from qualitative policy research could be applied. Often the question focused on the relationship of the sample under study to a larger population of policy interest (generalization from sample to population), but it also dealt with the relationship of what was being learned in individual sites to that at a "typical" site (generalization from case to sample). Moreover, participants in this debate were quick to note that such a concern about "statistical generalizability" failed to consider the fact that policy makers seldom were concerned solely about the effects of a given treatment on a specific population at one point in time. Rather they were continually attempting to extrapolate from current experience to future aspirations. Cronbach (1982, p. 76), for example, argues that "The evaluation of a program [should lead] to a statement about what to expect if a certain plan of action is adopted (or continued) in a certain site or class of sites." Such forecasting required inferences that went well beyond statistical generalization--a problem not peculiar to

qualitative research.

Traditional ethnography ignores issues of generalization and forecasting; it is radically particularistic. Spradley & McCurdy (1972, p. 3) define ethnography as "the task of describing a particular culture" and differentiate it from ethnology which compares and explains. To Wolcott (1975, p. 112) "An ethnography is, literally, an anthropologist's 'picture' of the way of life of some interacting group." Such a research tradition avoids efforts to explain, generalize, or draw lessons for application in other settings.

Sociologists doing qualitative research tended to be more willing to go beyond description. They had written widely on how qualitative research can be used to build theory, including concepts and explanations. Glaser and Strauss (1967), for example, do not limit themselves to the study of a single well-defined "case." They and other qualitatively oriented sociologists proceed by generating explanations about a single social system intuitively and then disaggregating that case to individuals or events in order to seek confirmation or disconfirmation (Campbell, 1975).

One problem with this approach was that it threw very little light on generalizability beyond the particular case or on the conditions under which explanations derived from that case were likely to hold. All generalizations are, of course, tentative. However, one federal official suggested that the strenght of generalizations from case studies could be increased if many cases were included and the sample met such criteria as substantial variety among cases, many similarities to the larger

population of interest, and few unique characteristics (Kennedy, 1979). This line of reasoning was a major force behind the increasing federal interest in multicase qualitative studies during the 1970s.

THE RELIABILITY ISSUE

For qualitative research the issue of reliability involves the accuracy and stability of measurement. Quantitative researchers typically give great attention to objective measurement by carefully designing and documenting procedures and instruments (Selltiz, Wrightsman & Cook, 1976). In traditional qualitatiave studies, there is less prespecification of data collection procedures in order to permit the reseasrcher to interact with the setting and gain insights in the process (Geer, 1967). This is one reason for the observation that qualitative research often increases construct validity at the expense of reliability (McGrath, 1982). Such a view does not imply that qualitative researchers were not concerned with accuracy. Rather they sought to achieve it through nonquantitative means. These included extensive immersion in a setting, triangulation to check insights and hypotheses via multiple sources, socialization to a relativistic viewpoint and especially the habit of introspection to check against personal bias (Wolcott, 1975).

While the ethnographer's approach to accuracy is well accepted within the community of qualitative reseachers, it was not viewed positively by most quantitative researchers, at least not initially (see Campbell & Stanley, 1966). Moreover, it

encountered two problems in the policy world not faced in the academic one. The first stemmed from the adversarial nature of some policy research. Findings that are unpopular or disadvantageous to an interest group are often attacked on methodological grounds. The researcher must be able to describe and defend data collection and analysis procedures. Further the data themselves may have to withstand extensive methdological critique and secondary analysis, as happened with two of the Coleman studies (see Mosteller & Moynihan, 1972; Hallinan & Olneck, 1982). Historically, qualitative researchers have had great difficulty disseminating their procedures and data in sufficient detail to make their studies amenable to either replication or secondary analysis.

The second problem associated with the reliability issue was specific to multisite research. Given the many sites needed to increase generalizability, the researchers seemed to lose the flexibility of the single-site design. With more than one site, comparability of data collection, reduction and analysis procedures across all sites tended to be given priority over in-depth description at individual sites. In general this was done to ensure that whatever similarities and differences were noted among sites stemmed from inter-setting rather than inter-researcher variation (Pelto & Pelto, 1978).

OVERVIEW OF THE REMAINDER OF THIS REPORT

Questions about the generalizability and reliability of qualitative policy research greatly influenced the field in the 1970s. The remainder of this report presents two papers

exploring those issues. The first draws upon a survey of 25 multisite studies in the field of education and focuses primarily on the issue of generalizability (see Part II). It will be published in the February 1983 issue of Educational Researcher. The second paper examines in greater detail five studies in order to describe and explain variation in how they addressed the reliability issue (Part III). It is intended for publication in Evaluation Review. Technical details related to both papers are presented in an appendix (Part IV).

REFERENCES

Campbell, D.T. Qualitative knowing in action research. Kurt Lewin Award Address, Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, 1974.

Campbell, D.T. "Degrees of freedom" and the case study. Comparative Political Studies, 1975, 8, 178-93.

Campbell, D.T. & Stanley, J.C. experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

Cronbach, L.J. Designing evaluations of educatdional and social programs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Geer, B. First days in the field. In P.E. Hammond (Ed.), Sociologists at work. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967.

Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A.L. The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualiative resarch. Chicago: Aldine, 1967.

Hallinan, M.T. & Olneck, M.B. (Eds.). Special issue on Public and Private Schools, Sociology of Education, 1982, 55, 63-182.

Kennedy, M.M. Generalizaing from single case studies. Evaluation Quarterly, 1979, 3, 661-78.

McGrath, J.E. Dilemmatics: The study of choices and dilemmas in the research process. In J.E. McGrath, J. Martin & R. Kulka (Eds.), Judgement calls in research. Beverly Hils, CA: Sage, 1982.

Mosteller, F. & Moynihan, D.P. (Eds.) On equality of educational opportunity. New York: Random House, 1972.

Mulhauser, F. Ethnography and policy-making: The case of education. Human Organization, 1975, 34, 311-15.

Pelto, P.J. & Pelto, G.H. Anthropological resesarch: The structure of inquiry (2nd ed.). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Selltiz, C., Wrightsman, L.S. & Cook, S.W. Research methods in social relations (3rd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1976.

Spradley, J.P. &McCurdy, D.W. (Eds.). The cultural experience: Ethnography in complex society. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1972.

Wolcott, H.F. Criteria for an ethnographic approach to research in education. Human Organization, 1975, 34, 111-28.

PART II

MULTISITE QUALITATIVE POLICY RESEARCH: OPTIMIZING DESCRIPTION AND GENERALIZABILITY[1]

Robert E. Herriott and William A. Firestone

The classical qualitative educational research design is the case study. Studies of school life (Cusick, 1973; Wolcott, 1973), of the larger social forces affecting schooling (Ogbu, 1974), and of efforts to promote planned educational change (Smith & Keith, 1971) have used qualitative data in describing a single social setting. Typically, such studies emphasize in-depth description but provide a weak basis for generalization to other settings.

The last decade, however, has seen the emergence of a new form of qualitative research, one intended to strengthen its ability to generalize while preserving in-depth description. These multisite qualitative studies address the same research question in a number of settings using similar data collection and analysis procedures in each setting. They consciously seek to permit cross-site comparison without necessarily sacrificing within-site understanding. Although having some roots in academic social sciences (e.g., see Clark, 1970; Whiting, 1963; Whiting & Whiting, 1975), multisite qualitative research arose

---

Robert E. Herriott is a research sociologist at 85 Jennie Dugan Road, Concord, MA 01742. William A. Firestone is Director of Field Studies, Research for Better Schools, 444 North Third Street, Philadelphia, PA 19123.

primarily in response to pressures from the federal government in the 1970s for studies that could overcome some of the weaknesses of large quantitative evaluations without being limited by the particularism of the single-site case study. Like many hybrids, it is today quite robust. However, these multisite qualitative studies were typically expensive endeavors and were done for specific policy purposes which the current federal administration seems neither to value nor to feel it can afford.

There are two important reasons for reflecting on the historical development and potential utility of multisite qualitative policy research at this time. Although it is unwelcomed by most social scientists, the current hiatus in commissioning policy research at the federal level provides researchers and policy makers with an opportunity to consider these issues in some detail. Further, the field of policy research has matured to the point where such considerations can be very fruitful. In recent years qualitative researchers have moved beyond the need to defend the legitimacy of their craft in the policy arena (Rist, 1977; Smith, 1978; Stake, 1978). Moreover, quantitative researchers are beginning to acknowledge a role for qualitative research in policy and evaluation studies (Cronbach, 1982; Hoaglin, Light, McPeek, Mosteller & Stoto, 1982) and to consider the proper balance of qualitative and quantitative techniques (Cook & Reichardt, 1979; Smith & Louis, 1982). In addition, practitioners of multisite qualitative policy research now exhibit sufficient confidence in their craftsmanship to begin a process of public self-criticism with

an eye to improving their methods (Firestone & Herriott, 1982; Miles, 1979; Smith & Louis, 1982; Yin, 1981).

Efforts to examine multisite qualitative policy research suffer, however, from the absence of descriptive data about the field's status and growth. While there are useful first-person accounts of individual projects (e.g., see Fetterman, 1982) the field lacks systematic knowledge about a range of studies. The sections that follow offer a start in that direction. First we review the context and concern that led to the use of this innovative design in the 1970s and describe briefly an early effort to employ it in educational research. We then present the results of a formal survey of 25 educational studies using this general design to highlight some of its institutional and methodological features. Finally we speculate about the future of this design and suggest ways in which it might be refined by academically oriented educational researchers.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The 1960s were a period of dramatic growth in federal funding of educational programs and the 1970s one of even greater growth in the sponsorship of research about them (National Institute of Education, 1976). Initially such federally funded policy research concentrated on the outcome of these programs, but gradually an expansion occurred from an exclusive concentration on pupil effects to an interest as well in program implementation and its contexts. Associated with this broadening in research focus was a shift in research designs from those that were exclusively quantitative to those

that were a mixture of quantitative and qualitative techniques and even ones that were exclusively qualitative. Although there was some advocacy in the 1970s for the use of better experimental designs in order to capture illusive program effects (see Bennett & Lumsdaine, 1975; Riecken & Boruch, 1974), the general thrust of methodological innovation during that decade seems to have been to better understand and measure program implementation. A key component of this effort was the use of qualitative data collection, reduction and analysis techniques.

The reasons for this emphasis on qualitative designs have not been well documented, but seem to involve a mixture of scientific and political considerations focused on issues of political utility, design validity, and forms clearance. Quite prominent in the thinking of one federal official was a concern that the early evaluation designs were "findings poor" in the sense that they provided policy makers with little understanding of why such programs as Head Start and Follow Through apparently had null effects or of how to improve them (Datta, 1982). A former federal official argues that the displeasure of policy makers with quantitative studies arose less from a concern about the lack of richness of their findings as from a concern about the findings themselves, "few of which were liked by program advocates." To him qualitative studies were attractive to policy makers because "case study approaches . . . tend to yield less controversial findings, ones with conclusions on both sides of a political decision" (Smith, personal communication, 1982).

Regardless of where one stood on the political utility of

quantitative experimental studies there also seems to have been disagreement about the validity of their key dependent variables--measures of pupil performance. To many program advocates the then existing standardized tests mitigated against the ability of even the best quantitative designs to show positive effects for those minority group members who were the object of the most ambitious federally funded educational efforts (Cohen, 1975). Ethnographic studies of minority children within the complex cultural context of their families, neighborhoods and schools were often thought to be more likely to document beneficial program effects.

In addition to such concerns about the validity of dependent variables were questions about that of the independent variables, particularly the degree to which programs implemented with federal funds were sufficiently faithful to the intentions of their designers, or enacted in a sufficiently uniform manner across most sites, to permit a meaningful test of their effects (Weiss and Rein, 1970). One federal official responsible for the design and implementation of the Follow Through planned variation experiments increasingly came to favor more qualitative studies which could assist him and his colleagues in understanding why Follow Through "models" were apparently being implemented so variously in different schools (McDaniels, personal communication, 1982).

A further contributor to the expansion from quantitative to qualitative policy studies seems to have been the growth of a cumbersome forms clearance process within the federal government. Although introduced originally to protect private

industry from obtrusive and redundant federal data collection for regulatory purposes, forms clearance in the 1970s was embroiled in issues of federal-state relations and of individual privacy and became a major obstacle to standardized data collection efforts in educational research (Datta, 1982). By the end of the decade it was rare to see a study of a federally funded educational program which did not at some point in its design rely on unstandardized data collection procedures, often to minimize (or eliminate) the "forms clearance hassle."

In sum, concerns about excessive reliance on effects studies of questionable utility and validity, desires for more attention to program implementation issues and efforts to avoid the "forms clearance hassle" combined to create a broad-based demand for policy research modeled more after the traditonal case study than after the traditional experiment.

THE RURAL EXPERIMENTAL SCHOOLS STUDY

The Rural Experimental Schools Study was the first large scale, federally funded educational research effort to explicitly attempt the production of generalizable findings using traditional case study methods at multiple sites. The federal official responsible for its general design was openly skeptical of the utility of exclusively quantitative methods in program evaluation and argued actively and successfully for a strong qualitative component (Budding, 1972). Abt Associates' proposal to study the program's ten rural sites adopted a two-pronged approach to optimizing description and generalizability--a series of quantitative cross-site studies

were to be carried out simultaneous with ten site-specific case studies. In describing the case study procedures, the project team placed great emphasis on the use of traditional ethnographic methods from the field of anthropology. Subsequently, experienced anthropologists and sociologists were recruited by Abt Associates to serve for approximately three years as full-time "on-site researchers" at each rural site (Herriott, 1977, 1982).

The major product of these field workers was to be a case study of the site's educational change project in the context of its school system, community, and broader sociocultural context. After considerable negotiations among field workers, the project's administration, and representatives of the funding agency (the National Institute of Education), it was agreed that within broad guidelines, the case study authors would be free to let events at their sites be the primary determinants of case study content (Fitzsimmons, 1975). In addition the field workers were to prepare detailed social and educational histories for each site, provide periodic qualitative reports on local events to those at Abt Associates' headquarters, and assist in the collection of structured data required for the quantitative cross-site studies.

The adoption of the case study method in its classical form allowed these researchers to learn about its strengths and weaknesses in the policy context and to develop adaptations to enhance generalizability. The strength of the Rural Experimental Schools Study proved to be its ability to generate in-depth description. The major product of the qualitative

segment of the study was eight book-length case studies of change projects (e.g., see Clinton, 1979; Firestone, 1980).

When the Rural Experimental Schools Study was commissioned little was known about how to use qualitative methodologies to develop general conclusions and initially less effort was devoted to that task than to the production of site-specific narratives. Over time, however, two important steps were made in the direction of generalizability. One involved the incorporation of qualitative data into studies that were originally intended to be solely quantitative cross-site comparisons. Thus the cross-site survey of organizational change processes used reports from the on-site researchers as a major source of data for its key dependent variable--the degree of comprehensive change at each site--as well as for insights about the nature of the change process in specific locations (Rosenblum & Louis, 1981). Equally important were efforts to synthesize insights from the case studies themselves to make generalizations about change processes in rural school districts. Limited by the decision to give the field workers autonomy with respect to the content of his/her study, these syntheses were carried out in two ways. One approach had the field workers write chapter-lenght case study narratives to a common outline and then asked outside experts to draw cross-case conclusions for policy makers and school administrators (Herriott & Gross, 1979). The second prepared more traditional "literature reviews" of the eight completed book-length case studies for policy makers (Herriott, 1980) and school administrators (Deal & Nutt, 1979).

A SURVEY OF MULTISITE QUALITATIVE STUDIES

The Rural Experimental Schools Study was part of the expansion in the use of multisite qualitative methods in the 1970s. To learn more about this trend we undertook a survey of federal officials and qualitatively oriented researchers. Through a snowball sampling process we identified 24 other projects which: (1) were federally funded via a competitive RFP process, (2) involved the application of qualitative methods of data collection within at least a major part of the overall design, and (3) intended to compare two or more organizationally based research sites.[2] One of the most noticeable features of these projects is that whereas single-site case studies arise almost exclusively within academia most of these multisite projects were located within the type of applied social research firm which at that time was specializing in <u>quantitative</u> policy research. Overwhelmingly the qualitative studies were imbedded within larger (multistudy) projects having quantitative components as well, and thus provided opportunities not only for cross-site qualitative synthesis, but for the integration of qualitative and quantitative data. The funding for these projects was rather extensive (typically over one million dollars) and their duration lengthly (typically at least two years).[3]

<u>Four Design Issues</u>

While the intent of multisite qualitative policy research is to optimize description and generalizability, there is a persistent tension between these two objectives which permeates

all research (Cook & Campbell, 1979; McGrath, 1982). In multisite qualitative research this tension seems to revolve around four design issues. The most prominent of these issues is the degree to which the data collection effort should be "structured" (Firestone & Herriott, 1982). Cross-site comparison and generalization require researchers at all sites to use shared definitions of concepts and common data collection procedures to ensure that cross-site similarities and differences are characteristics of the sites and not the result of measurement procedures or researcher bias (Pelto & Pelto, 1978). Yet such standardization encourages researchers to ignore the unique aspects of each site and to overlook processes and contexts that may make special contributions to the phenomena of interest. They also encourage the researchers to impose their definitions of the situation through premature conceptualization (Blumer, 1969).

A high degree of structuring of data collection is obtained through the use of closed-end, precoded questionnaires and interview schedules. Unstructured modes of data collection include unobtrusive observation and schedule-free interviewing. These are the primary forms of data collection for most traditional case studies. Our snowball sampling process excluded projects that relied primarily on highly structured data collection. Nevertheless, when we examined the data collection procedures employed by a major qualitative study within each of these 25 projects, we were surprised to find that only five relied primarily on unstructured data collection techniques. The other 20 employed primarily a variety of

semi-structured procedures, including site-visit guides which specify the questions that must be answered but not the specific data sources to be used, open-end interview guides, and instructions for focused observation. Such methods require that research issues be well thought out in advance rather than being derived "in the field." This heavy reliance on semi-structured procedures is clearly a major departure from the traditional single-site case study approach. It seems to represent an accomodation in the direction of quantitative methods, one made in order to facilitate cross-site comparison.

A second design issue concerns the number of sites to be studied. To a point, generalizability is enhanced by the inclusion of many sites (Kennedy, 1979). However, for any given budget level, increasing the number of sites limits the resources that are available for describing and analyzing events at any one site or for cross-site comparison. Within this sample, the fewest sites studied was three and the most was 60 with a median of 11. The 25 studies seem to cluster into three distinct groups: those with three thru six sites (7 instances), those with eight thru 22 sites (13 instances), and those with 30 thru 60 sites (5 instances). The five studies with over 30 sites raise an interesting question: how does one synthesize the mass of qualitative data from so many locations when attempting to draw generalizations? One risk in attempting such a cross-site analysis is that the analyst will draw on the sites selectively, thus reducing data complexity but at the expense of representativeness. One alternative to such selectivity is to quantify the qualitative data through the use of rigorous coding

schemes so that formal statistical models can be used in carrying out the cross-site analysis. Yet such quantification can undermine the descriptive value of qualitative research that the multisite design is intended to exploit.

A third issue is the length of time to be spent at each site for purposes of data collection. Long-term immersion (generally of over one year) is the hallmark of classical ethnography (Wolcott, 1975) and is an important means of ensuring valid description (Dawson, 1982). However, increasing the amount of time at any one site limits the resources available for studying other sites and for cross-site comparison and generalization. On-site presence in this sample of 25 studies fell into three broad categories: one or two short visits to each site (10 instances), several intermittent visits (7 instances), and more continuous field work (8 instances).

Finally, the research team can emphasize site-specific reporting, as was done in the Rural Experimental Schools Study, or cross-site, issue-specific reporting. Site-specific reporting is a literary device that enhances description but tends to mask similarities and differences across sites, thereby inhibiting generalization. Cross-site, issue-specific reporting facilitates generalization, but often at the expense of site-specific context. Although most of the 25 studies we surveyed used both site-specific and cross-site qualitative reporting formats, 12 emphasized the former and 13 the latter.

Inter-issue Patterns

In conducting this survey of multisite qualitative policy research projects we sought to uncover possible patterns in the

degree to which decisions affecting one of these four design issues are associated with decisions on the other three. For example, it seemed that the number of sites could well be an important factor in determining the degree to which report narratives emphasize site-specific phenomena, for there might be a point at which site-specific narrative becomes too cumbersome to utilize across all sites. Such a pattern does exist across these 25 projects. Whereas 6 of the 7 projects having six or fewer sites made extensive use of site-specific narrative, none of the 5 projects with 30 or more sites did so. However, when we looked for associations between gross categories of the other five pairs of the four design decisions we could find none, suggesting little pervasive pattern in how the number of sites, the degree of on-site presence, the degree of emphasis upon unstructured data collection, and the degree of emphasis on within-site narrative covary.[4]

The absence of patterning among all four design variables could simply reflect our inability to properly conceptualize or measure the most important choices faced by those responsible for these 25 studies, but we are inclined to view it as reflecting two other considerations. In particular it is important to keep in mind the very recent origin of this research form. During the past decade the logical connections among its various design options have been influenced by considerable experimentation on the part of both federal officials and researchers, as together they endeavored to understand better its strengths and weaknesses. However, it must also be kept in mind that such experimentation has taken

place within a context in which "the logic of science must come to terms with the logic of politics (Cronbach, 1982, p.ix)." Any policy research project arises within a unique political environment. Further each project is modified over time to reflect changes in that environment as they are interpreted by various federal officials and social scientists engaged in its design and implementation. Although policy researchers are clearly influenced by the logic of science, their design and implementation decisions are not simply the result of the application of that logic to explicit a priori policy questions. Rather, their decisions result from the interaction of political and scientific considerations from the time of the earliest conception of the need for research through the completion of the final report document. As a result no complex pattern of design and implementation choices can best satisfy the political requirements of more than a single project.

THE FUTURE OF MULTISITE QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

Multisite qualitative research flourished in the federal policy arena of the 1970s. It grew out of the qualitative traditions of academic social science and was modified to take into account the larger scale and more diverse audience of the policy arena. Unfortunately its future utility at the federal or state level or in academia is at present unclear. At the federal level, the future of this research approach is enmeshed in debates about the government's responsibility for social action programs and for research. All of the 25 projects we surveyed were initiated to determine how the federal government

can intervene more effectively to improve service delivery at the state or local level. While the current administration clearly eschews such activism at the federal level as a matter of policy, it remains to be seen whether the federal government can fully divest itself of this responsibility. To the extent that it cannot--or to the extent that an administration oriented to state and local control chooses to fulfill its responsibilities by conducting research and demonstration programs to provide knowledge without imposing mandates for action--the use of multisite qualitative studies will continue. Also likely to facilitate the further use of this innovative method are sophisticated policy research efforts at the state level. The evalutation of the California School Imporvement Program, for example, involved extensive field work in 24 schools in 14 districts (Berman, Weiler, Czesak, Gjelten & Izu, 1981).

The current hiatus in the commissioning of large-scale policy research provides academically oriented educational researchers with unusual opportunities to experiment with this design. In the process multisite qualitative research will have to be adapted to the academic setting which, unlike the federal policy context, generally requires that research be done at more modest cost but with longer time lines.

Academic researchers can facilitate the development of multisite qualitative research by addressing a broad range of methodological issues. For example, one current need is to understand better the consequences of different staffing patterns for data collection. This is an especially important

issue in qualitative research where the researcher is often the crucial "instrument" (Sanday, 1979). It may be useful to conduct research which compares alternative data collection patterns. One such pattern is the use of a single investigator to carry out all field work in all sites (see Metz, 1978). Such an approach standardizes the data collection "instrument" across sites without sacrificing the potential for in-depth description, but it seems limited to situation involving no more than three or four sites. An alternative possibility is to provide greater data collection structure across multiple field workers, either through the use of field manuals (Campbell & Levine, 1973) or by having the different field workers prepare case study narratives for their sites using a common format agreed to after conducting some field work (see Herriott & Gross, 1979). Although there has been some effort to compare such approaches, it has not been as systematic or as extensive as it could be (Perlman, 1973). It would also be useful to know the conditions under which it is preferable to use "local" residents or professional researchers as field observers and about the advantages and disadvantages of doing cross-site comparison and generalization with field workers collaborating "in committee" or with "outside experts" who work only with the site-specific case study narratives.

Another crucial issue is the consequences of different approaches to the standardized reduction of unstandardized data. Such reduction is a necessary first step to any analysis within or across sites (Goetz & LeCompte, 1981). The potential of any study for useful, valid description and generalization depends

'on the analysts' ability to reduce data to a manageable form without distortion or loss of meaningful detail. Studies with a large number of sites, or where the principal investigator is not intimately familiar with all locations, are especially dependent on their approaches to data reduction. While we currently have some craft discussion of how data reduction was done in specific projects, we need to know more about the advantages and disadvantages of the quantification of qualitative data (see Louis, 1982; Talmage & Rasher, 1981), and of verbal tabular and graphic data reduction devices (see Huberman & Miles, 1983; Smith & Nerenberg, 1981). Other issues in need of attention are the timing of site visits in light of the phenomena under study, examination of processes and outcomes at different programatic levels (student, classroom, school, district, etc.) and alternative modes of presenting the results of research to policymakers.

Due to the pressure of time, major methodological issues of the type illustrated above can seldom be addressed systematically in the course of policy studies. Academically oriented methodological studies represent an opportunity to more fully explicate the logic of this developing research form and to examine in detail its applicability in various policy contexts.

NOTES

1. This paper has been prepared with support from The National Institute of Education under contract No. 400-80-0019. It does not, however, necessarily reflect the view of that agency. We are particularly indebted to Fritz Mulhauser of the Institute's staff for his unfailing facilitation of our research.

2. The snowball sampling process began with several highly visible qualitative researchers (Karen S. Louis, Matthew B. Miles, Ray C. Rist, Robert Yin) and federal officials (Edward Glassman, Frederick Mulhauser, Marshall Smith, James Vanecko). Through their recommendations--and the recommedations of persons suggested by them--a roster of approximately 100 candidate projects was created. Subsequent telephone calls to a person more knowledgeable about each project led to the elimination of approximately 75 projects, in most cases due to a failure to satisfy all three of the sampling criteria. For those projects meeting all criteria arrangements were made for a one-hour telephone interview, generally with the project's director. At the time of the interview the informant was queried about his/her project using a highly-structured "project profile" sheet as a guide. After the interview was finished a draft copy of the complete profile was sent to the informant and modifications requested if necessary. After the full set of 25 profiles had been created and reviewed, they were used to code each project in terms of a series of summary categories. The key informants then reviewed that coding and suggested whatever further modification of the profile sheets or summary tables seemed warranted.

3. For a detailed description of each of the 25 projects, see Appendix A.

4. For the basic tables supporting these conclusions, see Appendix C.

REFERENCES

Bennett, C.A. & Lumsdaine, A.A. (Eds.). Evaluation and experiment: Some critical issues in assessing social programs. New York: Academic Press, 1975.

Berman, P., Weiler, D., Czesak, K., Gjelten, T. & Izu, J. A. How schools view and use the School Improvement Program: Preliminary hypotheses. Berkeley, CA: Manifest International, 1981.

Blumer, H. Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Budding, D. Draft discussion paper on Experimental Schools Program. Washington, DC: Experimental Schools Program, 1972.

Campbell, D.T. & LeVine, R.A. Field-manual anthropology. In R. Naroll & R. Cohen (Eds.), A handbook of method in cultural anthropology. New York: Columbia University Press, 1973.

Clark, B.R. The distinctive college: Antioch, Reed & Swathmore. Chicago: Aldine, 1970.

Clinton, C.A. Local success and federal failure: A study of community development and educational change in the rural South. Cambridge, MA: Abt Books, 1979.

Cohen, D.K. The value of social experiments. In A.M. Rivlin & P.M. Timpane (Eds.), Planned variation in education: Should we give up or try harder? Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1975.

Cook, T.D. & Campbell, D.T. Quasi-experimental design: Design and analysis issues for field settings. Chicago, IL: Rand-McNally, 1979.

Cook, T.D. & Reichardt, C.S. (Eds.). Qualitative and quantitative methods in evaluation research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1979.

Cronbach, L.J. Designing evaluations of educational and social programs. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Cusick, P.A. Inside high school: The student's world. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1973.

Datta, L. Strange bedfellows: The politics of qualitative methods. American Behavioral Scientist, 1982, 26(1), 133-144.

Dawson, J.A. Qualitative research findings: What do we do to improve and estimate their validity? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 1982.

Deal, T.E. & Nutt, S.C. Promoting, guiding and surviving change in school districts. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates Inc., 1979.

Fetterman, D.M. Ethnography in educational research: The dynamics of diffusion. Educational Researcher, 1982, 11(3), 17-22, 29.

Firestone, W.A. Great expecations for small schools: The limitations of federal projects. New York: Praeger, 1980.

Firestone, W.A. & Herriott, R.E. The formalization of qualitative research: An adaptation of "soft" science to the policy world. In R.E. Herriott & W.A. Firestone (Eds.) Multisite qualitative policy research in education: A study of recent federal experience. Concord, MA: Authors, 1982. (Final Report No. NIE-400-80-0019).

Fitzsimmons, S.J. The anthropologist in a strange land. Human Organization, 1975, 34, 183-196.

Goetz, J.P. & LeCompte, M.D. Ethnographic research and the problem of data reduction. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 1981, 12(1), 51-70.

Herriott, R.E. Ethnographic case studies in federally-funded multi-disciplinary policy research: Some design and implementation issues. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 1977, 9(2), 106-115.

Herriott, R.E. Federal initiatives and rural school improvement: Findings from the Experimental Schools Program. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates Inc., 1980.

Herriott, R.E. Tensions in research design and implementation: The Rural Experimental Schools Study. American Behavioral Scientist, 1982, 26(1), 23-44.

Herriott, R.E. & Gross, N. (Eds.). The dynamics of planned educational change: Case studies and analyses. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1979.

Hoaglin, D.C., Light, R.J., McPeek, B., Mosteller, F. & Stoto, M.A. Data for Decisions: Information strategies for policymakers. Cambridge, MA: Abt Books, 1982.

Huberman, A.M. & Miles, M.B. Drawing valid meaning from qualitative data: Some techniques of data reduction and display. Quality and Quantity, 1983, 17, forthcoming.

Kennedy, M.M. Generalizing from single case studies. Evaluation Quarterly, 1979, 3, 661-678.

Louis, K.S. Sociologist as sleuth: Integrating methods in the RDU Study. American Behavioral Scientist, 1982, 26(1), 101-120.

McDaniels, Garry L. Telephone interview with Robert E. Herriott, July 27, 1982.

McGrath, J.E. Dilematics: The study of research choices and dilemmas. In J.E. McGrath, J. Martin & R. Kulka (Eds.), Judgment calls in research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1982.

Metz, M.H. Classrooms and corridors: The crisis of authority in desegregated secondary schools. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1978.

Miles, M.B. Qualitative data as an attractive nuisance: The problem of analysis. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1979, 24, 590-601.

National Institute of Education. 1976 data book: The status of educational research and development in the United States. Washington, DC: Author, 1976.

Ogbu, J.U. The next generation: An ethnography of education in an urban neighborhood. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Pelto, P.J. & Pelto, G.H. Anthropological research: The structure of inquiry (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

Perlman, M.L. The comparative method: The single investigator and the team approach. In R. Naroll & R. Cohen (Eds.), A handbook of method in cultural anthropology. New York: Columbia University Press, 1973.

Riecken, H.W. & Boruch, R.F. (Eds.). Social experimentation: A method for planning and evaluating social intervention. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Rist, R. On the relations among educational research paradigms: From disdain to detente. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 1977, 8(2), 42-49.

Rosenblum, S. & Louis, K.S. Stablity and change: Innovation in an educational context. New York: Plenum, 1981.

Sanday, P.P. The ethnographic paradigm(s). Administrative Science Quarterly, 1979, 24, 527-539.

Smith, A.G. & Louis, K.S. (Eds.). Multimethod policy research: Issues and applications. American Behavioral Scientist, 1982, 26(1), 1-144.

Smith, A.G. & Nerenberg, S. Parents and federal educational programs, Vol. 5: Follow Through. Santa Monica, CA: System Development Corporation, 1981.

Smith, L.M. An evolving logic of participant observation, educational ethnography and other case studies. In L. Schulman (Ed.). Review of Research in Education: Vol. 6. Chicago: Peacock, 1978.

Smith, L.M. & Keith, P.M. Anatomy of educational innovation: An organizational analysis of an elementary school. New York: Wiley, 1971.

Smith, Marshall S. Letter to Robert E. Herriott, June 28, 1982.

Stake, R.E. The case study method in social inquiry. Educational Researcher, 1978, 7(2), 5-8.

Talmage, H. & Rasher, S.P. Quantifying qualitative data: The best of both worlds. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 1981.

Weiss, R.S. & Rein, M. The evaluation of broad-aim programs: Experimental design, its difficulties, and an alternative. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1970, 15, 97-109.

Whiting, B.B. (Ed.). Six cultures: Studies of child rearing. New York: Wiley, 1963.

Whiting, B.B. & Whiting, J.W.M. Children of six cultures: A psycho-cultural analysis. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1975.

Wolcott, H.F. The man in the principal's office: An ethnography. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1973.

Wolcott, H.F. Criteria for an ethnographic approach to research in schools. Human Organization, 1975, 34, 111-128.

Yin, R.K. The case study crisis: Some answers. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1981, 26, 58-65.

PART III

THE FORMALIZATION OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH: AN ADAPTATION OF "SOFT" SCIENCE TO THE POLICY WORLD[1]

William A. Firestone and Robert E. Herriott

A major development in evaluation and policy research in the 1970s was the introduction of qualitative techniques from anthropology, history, political science, and sociology (Cook & Reichardt, 1979). However, the use of these techniques in the policy arena often differed greatly from that in the academic settings in which they originated. There seem to have been two reasons for this difference. The first was a concern for generalizability and reliability that resulted from the early domination of policy research by quantitative economists and psychologists (e.g., see Riecken & Boruch, 1974). The second was the need for qualitative researchers, like their quantitative predecessors, to respond to the requirements of relevance, timeliness, and utility of the policy arena (see Coleman, 1972).

These two factors combined to produce a "formalization" of qualitative research having five major elements[2]. The first relates to the intent of the inquiry.

1. Whereas traditional qualitative research tends to emphasize in-depth description, formalized qualitative research emphasizes explanation.

William A. Firestone is Director of Field Studies, Research for Better Schools, 444 North Third Street, Philadelphia, PA 19123. Robert E. Herriott is a research sociologist at 85 Jennie Dugan Road, Concord, MA 01742.

A second element regards the organizational form of the inquiry.

2. Whereas traditional qualitative research tends to emphasize the conduct of inquiry by a single individual, formalized qualitative research emphasizes the use of a multiperson team.

The three additional elements have to do with the methodology of the inquiry.

3. Whereas traditional qualitative research tends to emphasize the discovery of relevant questions and variables while in the field, formalized qualitative research emphasizes the codification of questions and variables before beginning fieldwork.

4. Whereas traditional qualitative research tends to emphasize unstructured questioning and observation, formalized qualitative research emphasizes the standardization of data collection procedures through the use of semistructured interview and observation protocols.

5. Whereas traditional qualitative research tends to emphasize extended presentation of verbal narrative, formalized qualitative research emphasizes the systematic reduction of verbal narrative to codes and categories.

While any one of these shifts alone would constitute a minor adaptation to the policy arena, the simultaneous occurrence of all five has produced a radical transformation in the way qualitative research is conducted. This transformation has been driven in part by the need to coordinate data collection in many sites and to ensure responsiveness to a client's need for cross-site conclusions. In addition, some advocates of such coordination argue that problem-driven research using standardized techniques for data collection and analysis increases the truth or accuracy of qualitative research by responding to standards of validity and reliability traditionally associated only with quantitative research (Huberman & Miles, 1983). To them, what we have characterized as "formalization" represents a major improvement in the way that qualitative research is conducted and appraised.

The advantages and disadvantages of this dramatic shift in the conduct of qualitative research are currently being debated by many of the principals (see, e.g., Louis, 1982; Miles, 1979; Rist, 1980; Wolcott, 1980; Yin, 1981). This paper does not enter that debate directly. Rather it seeks to inform it by examining in some detail five policy research projects. All five projects used research teams to carry out qualitative field work at multiple sites with the intent of making cross-site generalizations. They differed substantially, however, in the formalization of their methodological approaches. Our research suggests three competing explanations for this variation: the technical requirements of the research, the demands of the research sponsors, and the interests of the research teams and their professional networks. While concerns about methodological adequacy and policy utility created a broad interest in the formalization of qualitative research in the 1970s (see Herriott & Firestone, 1983), decisions about how much formalization would occur in specific instances seem to reflect the preferences of the research team more than any other factor.

To date variation on grounds of personal and professional preference has provided a useful way for policy researchers and their federal sponsors to experiment with alternative approaches. However, the field of policy research currently needs stronger guidance on how much formalization of qualitative research is appropriate under various technical circumstances. Such guidance is likely to be most useful if the degree of formalization thought to be most appropriate for particular research purposes is linked to realistic assumptions about the scientific and political requirements that qualitative policy research must meet (Cronbach, 1982). It is to those requirements, and how they were addressed in the 1970s, that we now turn.

A STUDY OF MULTISITE STUDIES

Our understanding of formalization in qualitative research comes from a study of five multisite policy research projects in the field of education. We began with a "snowball" sampling process whereby we asked federal officials and educational researchers to help us identify projects which: (1) were federally funded via a competitive "request for proposals" (RFP) process, (2) involved the application of qualitative methods of data collection within at least a major part of the overall design, and (3) intended to compare two or more research sites. After identifying 25 such projects, we conducted telephone interviews with a key staff member (generally the director) in each. Our examination of those projects showed a great deal of variation in the standardization of data collection through the use of structuring devices. However, the apparent absence of association between the use of these devices and other variables raised a number of questions about how multisite qualitative studies are designed and implemented (Herriott and Firestone, 1983).

To learn more about the dynamics of the research process, we initiated our own multisite study of five projects. All 25 projects were arrayed in terms of two variables thought to be associated with formalization: the number of sites and the length of time spent in collecting data at each site. Finally we selected for intensive study one project from each of the five cells where either variable was relatively high (Table 1).[3]

The five projects are:

- The Rural Experimental Schools (RES) Study. Initiated in 1972, this complex multimethod project at Abt Associates Inc. explored the utility of comprehensive change efforts for reforming schools. In one of its five major substudies, ethnographic field work was conducted in 10 rural school districts over a three-year period by full-time "on-site researchers" trained in the discipline of anthropology or

Table 1

Distribution of 25 Studies by Length of Time on Site and the Number of Sites. (The five studies selected for intensive study are identified parenthetically.)

Length of Time on Site	Number of Sites		
	2-5	6-15	16+
One or two short visits	2	3	5 (EBCE)
Several intermittent visits	1	5 (DESSI)	0
Many repeated visits or continuous presence	3 (CIP)	3 (RES)	3 (PI)

Note: For the identity of all 25 studies in the survey sample, see Appendix A.

sociology. The field work was coordinated by Stephen J. Fitzsimmons, Robert E. Herriott and Michael B. Kane.[4]

- The Experienced-Based Career Education (EBCE) Study. This research by The Huron Institute was inaugurated in 1976 to learn if EBCE "models" developed by four regional educational laboratories would be effective when exported to a wide variety of public school settings. Attention was also given to learning about program implementation as a social process. Over a three-year period three social scientists made several short visits to 45 schools. The amount of time spent at each school site varied from one to 22 person days. Field work was conducted by Peter Cowden, John DeSanctis and Eleanor Farrar with David Cohen serving as senior advisor.

- The Career Intern Program (CIP) Study. The CIP program originated at one site as a promising way to train minority youth to be employable workers or enter higher education. In 1978 it expanded to four geographically scattered sites. Through a multimethod study the RMC Corporation investigated what happens when an attempt is made to replicate the prototype in new settings, what produces "successful" program outcomes and what those outcomes were. For purposes of the ethnographic substudy, approximately seven rounds of two-week visits were made to each site by a trained anthropologist. Key senior staff members included David Fetterman, Peter Treadway and Kasten Tallmadge.

- The Parental Involvement (PI) Study. Begun in 1978, this large-scale project conducted by System Development Corporation described the form and extent of parental involvement within four federal educational programs. Data were collected at 57 sites over a four-month period by half-time, on-site field researchers. The formal academic training of these field workers varied from the pre-bachelors to post-doctoral level. All field work was coordinated by a staff of social scientists which included Ward Keesling, Ralph Melarangno, Al Robbins and Allen Smith, each of whom played an active role in cross-site data analysis.

- The Dissemination Efforts Supporting School Improvement (DESSI) Study. This complex multimethod study was commissioned in 1978 to reconsider assumptions underlying federal dissemination strategies, to learn how school districts undertake planned change, and to examine whether the federal government should promote fidelity to externally developed program models or local adaptations. Under the direction of David P. Crandall, The Network Inc. coordinated the work of a series of subcontractors, one of whom undertook case studies of 12 schools. Field work of approximately eight days per site was carried out over a three-month period by

Jo Ann Goldberg, A. Michael Huberman, Matthew B. Miles and Beverly Taylor, with Huberman and Miles subsequently conducting the cross-site analyses.

Three projects were supported by the National Institute of Education and two by the Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation in the Office (later Department) of Education. All five were carried out by private corporations, a situation characteristic of federally funded policy research in the 1970s. All were multimethod endeavors (Louis, 1982) which included quantitative surveys in addition to the "case studies" we focused on. They ranged in duration from 33 months (PI) to eight years (RES). (See Appendix D for an annotated bibliography of illustrative publications from each project.)

To learn about these projects, we reviewed such documents as requests for proposals, the proposals themselves, assorted planning documents, final reports, and published books and articles. In four cases we conducted extensive interviews with key project staff at their offices to learn about things not apparent in the documents. The interviews focused on the natural history of each project, the interests of project staff and relevant outsiders, and a series of methodological and administrative dilemmas that we anticipated would arise frequently in multisite qualitative policy research. We spent from six to twelve hours talking with several members of each project team. (This step was not taken with the RES study since we had been members of its staff, Herriott as the project's director and Firestone as an on-site researcher.) For all five projects we later talked to at least one of the federal officials responsible for its monitoring to better understand the projects' history and obtain a client perspective. Our presentation of these five projects begins with a description of the extent to which its most qualitative component was formalized. It then considers

the extent to which such formalization was influenced by three sets of factors that might guide the design and implementation of policy research.

FORMALIZATION IN QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

Formalized qualitative research projects tend to have more codified research questions at the beginning, more standardized data collection procedures, and more systematic means to reduce verbal data to categories for analysis. Table 2 describes variation among our five projects in terms of each of these definitional elements.

The classical qualitative research begins with only the most tentative research problem, and the first days in the field become an important time for fleshing out an understanding of the phenomena of interest (Geer, 1969). Formalized qualitative research begins with well specified conceptual models and uses early field work to refine the conceptualization and either to check the feasibility of questions or primarily to collect the necessary data. RES embraced the traditional ethnographic field work model most fully, delegating the task of designing case studies to the individual on-site researchers, each of whom was an experienced field worker. Thus, there was never a central guiding conceptualization for its qualitative research. The EBCE team reported to us that in retrospect they could see the seeds of their major findings in their earliest proposal--perhaps reflecting ideas that they had developed in doing other studies of implementation--but neither they nor the CIP team developed any formal <u>a priori</u> conceptualization to guide the research. PI and DESSI operated very differently. One staff member from the PI team devoted the first few months of the project to generating a model which elaborated five dimensions of parental involvement; he devoted less attention to specifying its causes

Table 2. Descriptive Characterization of Five Projects on Eight Indicators of Formalization

Indicator of Formalization	Project				
	RES	ZBCE	CIP	DESSI	PI
Codification					
1. Formal a priori Conceptualization	None	Implicit based on thinking on implementation	Minimal, mostly from proposal	Detailed explication of the major variables thought to affect educational change efforts	Detailed explication of five dimensions of parental involvement
2. Purpose of Earliest Field Work	To become grounded in the site and its larger sociocultural context	To explore the phenomenon of experience based career education at each site	To become acquainted with the key personnel of each site	To collect initial data on the various a priori variables and refine the conceptualization	To collect initial data on each of the five dimensions
Standardization					
3. Dominant Early Data Collection Format	Unstructured observation and interviewing	Unstructured observation and interviewing	Mostly unstructured interviewing and observation loosely guided by proposal	Informal interviewing and observation, some semi-structured.	Highly structured extensive "analysis packets" based on conceptualization
4. Dominant Later Data Collection	Unstructured observation and interviewing	Semi-structured observation and interviewing	Mostly unstructured interviewing & observation guided by emerging conceptualization	Semi-structured interview guide based on conceptualization	Semi-structured extensive "analysis packets" based on conceptualization
Reduction/Analysis					
5. Site-specific Data Reduction Approach	Left to discretion of each fieldworker at each site	Transfer of field notes into a notebook for each site & rating of each site on a series of emergent variables	Summaries by site on programmatic topics	Systematic coding of field notes and preparation of a standardized site summary for each site	Site summaries by field workers and synthesis by central staff
6. Site-specific Data Presentation Approach	Extended narrative case studies for eight sites Brief semi-structured case studies for five sites	Frequent use of illustrative quotes and vignettes for unidentified sites	Chapter length case studies in topical report	Standardized charts for each site Semi-structured case studies for each site	Standardized verbal tables comparing sites on variables Frequent use of illustrative quotes and vignettes
7. Cross-site Data Analysis Procedures	Traditional literature reviews by various non-field workers of draft case studies	Intuitive analysis by the three field workers as a team	Intuitive analysis by the single field worker responsible for cross-site analysis	Display and systematic analysis of data using pictorial techniques by two of the four field workers	Formation of analysis committees of non-fieldworkers to systematically sort sites and variables
8. Intersubjective Checks on Data Reduction and Analysis	Multiple independent synthesizers	Informal discussion by the two field workers when on site trips Collaborative review of field notes & draft analyses by the three field workers	Informal discussion of facts of each case by research team	Collaborative review of field notes and draft analyses	Periodic discussion between field workers and their supervisors Creation of "analysis committees" of supervisors
Overall Index of Formalization	Low	Moderate	Moderate	High	High

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and consequences. The DESSI team developed a comprehensive model of the major variables thought to affect educational change efforts and explicated 34 research questions. The RES, EBCE & CIP teams used early field work to become grounded conceptually, with RES & EBCE making explicit reference to using the first year to develop their theory along the lines suggested by Glaser and Strauss (1967). The PI and DESSI teams moved more quickly to collecting the data called for by their conceptual models although those models were modified somewhat over time (see Table 2, Indicators 1 and 2).

Data collection techniques can vary on a continuum from unstructured, where researchers simply observe and ask questions, to highly structured, where closed-ended precoded instruments are used. Exclusive reliance on precoded instruments was eliminated because it was considered quantitative rather than qualitative research. However, there was considerable variation over the rest of the continuum. The RES study never had a centrally imposed structure for qualitative data collection. However, over time some of the onsite researchers became progressively more structured in their approach, but only one developed formal interview guides. In contrast such progressive focusing was the rule on EBCE and CIP. At the end of the first round of site visits the EBCE team took time to reassess its research objectives and to write position papers. They used the insights gained from that collective process to guide later field work. Field work for CIP was done in seven rounds of site visits. What was learned in the first was checked later. PI and DESSI relied primarily on semi-structured guides. PI developed theirs before the field work from the a priori conceptualizations. DESSI finalized forms after the first, brief round of site visits. In both cases field work was geared to completing those guides, and there was frequent monitoring by senior researchers on both teams to assure that

adequate data were collected to answer each question at each site (Table 2, Indicators 3 & 4).

Data reduction is the task of condensing information about each site to manageable proportions, and it too can vary in its prespecification, with more standardized modes generally thought to facilitate cross-site analysis. RES essentially left this task to the discretion of the individual onsite researchers, and no formalized procedures were used in CIP since a single field worker covered all four sites. EBCE experimented with a number of techniques, including creating a three-ring binder for each site in which field notes were cut up and organized by standard topics, and the use of wall charts to portray sites and topics in matrix form. In PI each field worker prepared a narrative summary of data and observations for his or her site. These were followed by site-specific syntheses done by the central staff following a standard outline and using the summaries and various interview forms as data. Before completing its field work, the DESSI team generated "interim" summaries of some sites and a case study outline with detailed data displays including dummy tables and tentative causal flow charts. These were subsequently completed for each case (Table 2, Indicator 5).

Generally, traditional qualitative approaches show their rigor through extensive presentation of data close to its raw form while formalized qualitative approaches emphasize presenting primarily higher order data, one or more steps removed from the original field notes. RES reported its qualitative site data through book-length case studies (Document A).[5] EBCE presented illustrative quotes and vignettes in the cross-site analysis, but the reader cannot form an understanding of any specific site (Document D). CIP used a similar approach but present chapter-length case

studies of each site (Document H). PI presented some site-specific vignettes, but displayed most of its data in extensive narrative tables with variables as rows and sites as columns (Document J). DESSI prepared case studies which are available to interested reviewers, but its public document features summary graphic displays for specific sites that were distilled from field notes during case study development (Document M)--Table 2, Indicator 6.

The credibility of cross-site qualitative analysis can often be increased by the use of explicit preplanned procedures, including rules and displays for coded data, and by intersubjective checks requiring that there be consensus within the research team on the accuracy of coding and analysis (Firestone and Dawson, 1982). RES did not use standardized procedures for cross-site analysis, but its use of multiple independent synthesizers of the case study narratives (and in one instance the simultaneous presentation of five syntheses in a single report--Document B) enhanced the credibility of its approach. EBCE and CIP relied on a similar form of intuitive cross-site analysis, although only one synthesis was done in each case. The use of a team of three researchers on the EBCE study provided some checks and created the opportunity for each researcher to have to defend his or her conclusions. Teamwork was less evident in the CIP case, but the overall project director aggressively reviewed and challenged all reports. PI required that all conclusions be apparent in cross-site analysis tables, and that both table entries and the overall patterns be defended in formal analysis committee meetings organized by conceptual element and by program studied (Document L). Within PI both attacks and defenses of conclusions were extremely spirited. The DESSI senior researchers developed complex and thorough procedures for sorting sites and

variables and for displaying the results (Document 0). They checked each other's work but not with the same degree of open review required by the group context of PI (Table 2, Indicators 7 and 8).

In order to summarize the narrative picture of these five projects we read across the eight rows of Table 2 several times to get a sense of the range of variation on each indicator. We then read down each of the five columns to discover the modal tendency within each project. Although our original intent was simply to divide the five projects into two ordered categories (low formalization and high formalization) the data reflected three (low, moderate, and high). The RES study stayed close to the traditional ethnographic approach by delegating the data collection and case study writing to individual onsite researchers and by deemphasizing standardized cross-site analysis. It was at the low extreme. DESSI and PI, with their early conceptualization, extensive instrumentation and standardized data reduction, analysis and reporting techniques, were at the opposite extreme. CIP and EBCE were intermediate (Table 2).

ALTERNATIVE EXPLANATIONS FOR VARIATION IN FORMALIZATION

In attempting to understand variation in formalization we first reviewed the extensive notes we had taken in reading the various project documents and in talking with project staff members and their federal monitors. Through this review, we identified three possible explanations for why these five projects were formalized to different extents. One emphasized the technical requirements of the research, particularly the generic questions that led to commissioning the study. A second emphasized the contractual relationship between the organization selected to conduct the research and its federal sponsor. The third emphasized the

predilections of the research team as professionals within an occupational group. We then reviewed our field notes a second time for evidence of the power of each explanation and summarized our findings by project and explanation. In so doing we were implementing an approach to qualitative research not too different from that of the five projects whose methods we were endeavoring to study.

Technical Requirements

To consider whether technical factors affected study formalization, we examined two issues: study purposes and the number of sites studied. These five studies include three program evaluations and two more general studies. RES, EBCE, and CIP focused on specific programs which were funded by the same agencies funding the research. The EBCE and CIP RFPs explicitly stated that the results would be used to plan the possible continuation of those programs. DESSI and PI addressed general policy issues and cut across several program agencies. Their importance to the continuation of specific programs was less clear. One might expect more formalization within the program evaluations where procedures for drawing inferences could conceivably be more subject to attack by entrenched political interests, than within the generic studies having more diffuse constituencies. In fact, the opposite was true in these five cases. DESSI and PI, the two generic studies, are also the most formalized. Moreover, upon closer examination the distinction between generic studies and evaluations turns out to be more apparent than real. In the case of the PI study, the managers of the four programs being studied--ESEA Title I, Follow Through, the federal Bilingual Program (ESEA Title VII), and the desegregation program (ESAA)--became concerned that the study might create a "horse race" in

which some would look better than the others. Thus, an evaluative dimension was perceived by program people even when it was not important to the research sponsors. The evaluative purposes of the two other studies proved irrelevant; decisions not to continue the Experimental Schools and EBCE programs were made in Washington well before their respective studies were completed. In those cases interest among members of the research team, and to a lesser extent among the research sponsors, turned from program evaluation to what could be learned about general processes of program implementation at the local level.

A second technical issue is the number of sites. Studies with more sites might be expected to be more formalized, either to increase comparability or to reduce data collection and analysis costs. Yet, as in our 25 project survey (Herriott & Firestone, 1983), we found no clear relationship between formalization and the number of sites. The two projects with the largest number of sites--PI with 57 and EBCE with 45--were highly and moderately formalized respectively; the next two--DESSI with 12 and RES with 10--were at the high and low extremes; and CIP, the project with the fewest sites (four), was moderately formalized. Here too, however, things are not as clear as they seem because the number of sites can easily change. The EBCE, DESSI and PI RFPs were quite ambiguous on this point. A fourth--RES--assumed that five sites would be included, but before the study began a sixth was added. One year later, primarily for reasons unrelated to study design, the federal Experimental Schools Program added four more sites, thereby doubling the original estimate.

The number of sites was also subject to more subtle redefinition. Thus, PI began as a single generic study with the same research questions and data collection procedures to be used at all 58 sites. However,

because of pressures from the four federal programs, it was agreed that an interprogram comparative analysis would not be conducted. Instead, four within-program analyses (each with about 15 sites) were carried out as parallel replications. Similarly, although the EBCE team visited 45 sites during the first phase of its three-phase data collection process, more time was spent at some than at others and many sites were not visited more than once. From one to 12 days were spent at different sites, with only a quarter of them visited for as many as seven days (Document C). As a result, the team reports that their theory generating work relied most heavily on about 15 of the 45 sites. In sum, technical factors associated with either general research purpose or the number of sites seem to have little predictable influence on the formalization of research. A major reason is that (at least for these five studies) technical factors, both abstract and seemingly concrete, are subject to frequent redefinition.

The Contractual Relationship

The purchaser of research might be expected to have a major influence on its design. Such a view from the federal side is made explicit by Baker (1975, p. 209-210) who explains that:

> Quite often the [federal] agency... knows how it wants the study conducted in evaluation research. . . . Many [federal] applied research administrators push for such a detailed specification of the problem and research design that the only important question left for the contractor is how much will it cost to carry out the agency's plan. The agency, knowing what it wants done and how it wants it done, is looking for a skilled staff to carry out its needs, not somebody else's desires.

After looking closely at federal request for proposal (RFP) preparation, contractor proposal writing and negotiation and the post-award administra-

tion for each project, we concluded that the federal sponsors rarely specified the degree of formalization of a study.

Selecting a Research Contractor. If Baker's view is correct, the federal agency's RFP is a critical document. It sets out the research specifications, leaving the proposers to compete to see who can best carry out those specifications. Yet, the RFPs for all five of these projects were much less clear than Baker's statement implies. In many ways they were little more than a Rorschach test, an ambiguous stimulus that could generate a broad range of design responses. Consider the views of one of the PI proposal writers who describes the methodology of the RFP as "funny."

> [The PI staff member] says that people were to go out to sites, but the number of sites was unclear. They were to collect some quantitative data, but they were also to do some interviews with key individuals in the district and with parents. There was supposed to be a division between quantitative data and interview data, but it was left to the proposers to work out the balance on depth vs. breadth. Moreover, the proposers were asked to discuss the tradeoffs.
>
> (from field notes of PI site visit)

The PI team's response was based partly on an estimate of what the agency wanted, but it also considered what it was competent to do and what it was interested in doing. A similar situation appeared within the RES study. The RFP clearly asked for descriptive "documentation" of each local project and required that one full-time person be assigned to live at each site. However, the nature of the documentation required was unclear; proposers were encouraged to consider approaches from a variety of academic disciplines including anthropology, but also history and sociology. Moreover, the project director perceived a conflict between these ambitious requirements for sound scholarship and the need (also specified in the RFP) to provide technical assistance to local districts—a need that would take the onsite researchers out of a nonparticipant researcher role.

In some cases, proposal writers tried to make an intelligent interpretation of RFP requirements. In other cases, such requirements were simply ignored. Thus, the DESSI RFP called for a "cross-sectional survey-interview" study; there was no hint of that being supplemented with an intensive qualitative case-study component. Such an activity was initiated solely by The Network in its successful proposal. In the EBCE case, the proposal writing team concluded that one of the key requirements in the RFP (a focus on the fidelity of program implementation at the local level) was ill advised in view of the then emerging findings of the Rand "Change Agent Study" on the importance of mutual adaptation (see Greenwood, Mann & McLaughlin, 1975). Sensing the conflict over the issue of fidelity--and believing that it did not make sense to pursue fidelity questions--they describe their proposal as "an intricate dance around" that issue. Although, after contract award, representatives of the federal sponsor continued to want a "discrepancy study," none was ever carried out.

There was only one case among the five we studied of an RFP clearly requiring something that the proposing team did not want to do where the funding agency successfully insisted that it be done. The CIP RFP required that one part of the study be "an ethnography," and the winning team did not know what ethnography was. How that issue was resolved to include an ethnographic component is described in the next section.

Generally, the ambiguity of the RFP stems from the numerous opportunities during the RFP development process for a variety of individuals to add pieces. An interest in building broad support for the procurement within the agency leaves unresolved contradictions in the RFP document. For instance, the federal official responsible for the preparation of the PI RFP had "been hearing about ethnography and other impressionistic

approaches." He saw the PI study as "a chance to break out and do a less quantitative, more qualitative study." However, according to him, the person with whom he was collaborating in preparing the RFP "was more oriented towards a survey—one with questionnaires or checklists—and tried from time to time to nudge the RFP back towards a more quantitative approach." Thus, it is not surprising that the methodological requirements in the PI RFP seemed "funny" to the proposal writers; they were developed by two people of competing methodological preferences.

Moreover, within the studies we examined, specific methodological expertise was never the most important factor in the agency's decision regarding which proposal to fund. Often the federal sponsors were primarily concerned with the known competence of the proposed staff. The initial RES project monitor explained that:

> It boiled down to a judgment on the nature of the staff and their orientation to the study. . . . Substantively, the proposal was on target. It was interesting and we were favorably inclined, but we were skeptical about what a proposal is worth.

To the PI project monitor management skills were more important than methodological orientations. He was looking for a "contractor who had the resources to have a lot of people out in the field at one time," one who could "get things done on time and within budget." Since the tasks in the contract's scope of work statement were acknowledged to be "less well defined" than was typically the case for that agency, it was anticipated that "the contract could easily get out of hand unless you had a strong contractor."

Our data clearly suggest that the procurement process is seldom a calculated search for the contractor with the best design to achieve prespecified federal objectives. It has been suggested that "it's more like a

pickup at a singles bar, with both parties wondering what will happen if they leave together."

Monitoring the Contractor. If federal influence is so limited during the selection process, will the agency perhaps have a greater impact after the contract is signed? On the basis of our data this seems unlikely. Listen to one experienced federal project monitor:

> Once you sign the contract you have very little power to do good and substantial power to do evil. You can hassle people, but you have a small margin in which to be constructive. A good headstrong contractor can easily tell you where to get off.

We found many instances where the project monitor seemed to avoid clear opportunities to influence the conduct of the research. The ethnographic component within the DESSI study underwent a major redesign after the contract was signed. The activity was totally restaffed from what was originally proposed, and the decision was made to have a core staff of four field workers instead of a larger group of people, one of whom would be located at each site. However, these changes were not in response to a federal initiative. The major redesign decision on the PI study--to create four separate within-program analyses--was influenced by the federal sponsor, but on nonmethodological grounds. However, this decision had methodological implications because it reduced the likelihood of extreme formalization and precluded the type of quantitative analysis suggested by the PI team in its proposal. This decision was not initiated by the federal project monitor. Rather it was an accommodation that the monitor and research team members made to the fears of a "horse race" voiced by officials of the four programs being studied. Generally, project monitors took what both they and the research team members described as a "collegial" approach

to contract monitoring. In general this meant that the researchers called the methodological shots.

In contrast to these examples of redesign by contractor initiative are two where the federal agency tried unsuccessfully to increase the level of formalization. The RES study director faced numerous pressures to increase the comparability of the ten case studies (Document C). All were successfully deflected, first by forcing the preparation of a memo of understanding which specified that the case studies were to be comparable only in the most general of terms (each was to consider the local Experimental Schools project in the context of its school district and the surrounding community) and then by insisting that case-study drafts be reviewed by experienced ethnographers in the light of that understanding.

The federal officials monitoring the EBCE contract also sought to turn it in a more quantitative direction. One federal official reports that "they really needed to use a larger number of [data] sources and methods," but such changes were never made.

We found only one case of a successful federal effort to affect the level of formalization of a project (the CIP study), and here the direction of influence was towards less formalization. At the time the contract was awarded, the project monitor negotiated an agreement that the project director believed required him to hire an ethnographer to work on the relevant task, subject to the approval of the federal government. The project monitor put the project director in touch with George and Louise Spindler, two well-known educational anthropologists. The Spindlers provided the contractor with an orientation to traditional ethnography and recommended two graduate students who were subsequently hired, but not

until they had been interviewed by the project monitor and his independent consultants on ethnography.

Interpretation. In spite of this rather dramatic counterexample, there seem to be severe limits to the client's influence on decisions affecting the formalization of research after the contract is signed. There are at least three reasons for these limits; changing sponsor priorities, staff turnover in Washington and contractor expertise. First, in all five studies, the commissioning agency lost its initial interest well before research was completed. Decisions about the fate of the EBCE and Experimental Schools program were made before either of these multi-year evaluations could generate research results that could affect program policy. In the EBCE case, changing priorities within the funding agency clearly gave the project team the opportunity to move in a direction questioned by several of its monitors. It was simply not worth the trouble to try to discontinue the contract or to take other radical steps needed to redirect the work. According to one of its federal monitors:

> [Even] by the time the study began people were beginning to lose interest in EBCE. After a year or two [the federal agency] was out of the EBCE business. . . and . . . by the end of the study programmatic interest was gone. They really didn't want to know what had happened. . . . Time had outpaced the study. . . . Had [the sponsoring agency] continued to have a big stake in EBCE, I could have seen [the team's] feet be really put to the fire.

Similarly, the arrival of the Reagan administration seemed to limit considerably federal interest in the results of the DESSI, PI and CIP studies.

A second factor is the turnover in federal project monitors. Only the DESSI study had the same monitor from start to finish; the RES study had 7 project monitors over eight years. Generally, the initial project monitors had a more active interest in the study than those who came later.

Declining interest and project officer turnover might result from the length of the research projects. The two studies where declining interest were most apparent--RES and EBCE--were also the longest--eight and four years respectively. The other three projects lasted 3.5 years (DESSI), 2.8 years (PI), and 2.5 years (CIP). Certainly, the length of these first two projects made continuity of federal oversight more difficult. However, it should be noted that the big loss of interest in both projects occurred in the first two years of each. Moreover, the project with the least turnover among project monitors was also rather long (3.5 years). Thus, elapsed time alone is insufficient to explain the changed personnel and interest on the federal side.

The third factor, although not as clear, is that the research teams seemed to have an advantage of influence through expertise that the federal project monitors often lacked. Thus, in both RES and EBCE, when agency staff had reservations about the work being produced, they commissioned special experts or panels to review the results and make recommendations. However, these groups never made explicit recommendations for clear action, such as changing the design of a major study component, that might have given the agency justification for exercising its formal authority. All five research teams also sought to increase their own claims to expertise by turning to eminent scholars and practitioners at crucial points in the life of their studies, sometimes at the suggestions of their federal sponsors, but more often to challenge them.

Professional Factors

At best the client-contractor relationship seems to only generally circumscribe the amount of formalization in the design of a multisite

qualitative research project. The detailed specification of research procedures seems to result more from the predilections of the research team, the team's reference groups, and the networks that it uses in seeking advice.

Predilections of the Research Team. The predilictions of the core staff of each team are not always predictable from their methodological training. Two of the three people who wrote the RES proposal and provided continuity and direction over the life of the project were trained as quantitative social scientists. However, the project director--Herriott--had just come to Abt Associates from a university professorship. Rather than being committed to a particular methodology he was inclined to borrow heavily from the most relevant established academic traditions. The established traditions of ethnography and sociological case studies recommended those approaches strongly to him. Moreover, both he and his deputy director for research--Steven Fitzsimmons--were strongly inclined to establish the credibility of the project through an emphasis on publication in accepted academic journals.

The people who made up the original team for the PI study, including Ward Keesling, Ralph Melaragno, Al Robbins, and Hilda Borko, were also trained in quantitative research methods although Allen Smith, an anthropologist, was added later. However, their experience at SDC also gave them reason to welcome alternative methodologies. On the one hand, the prior experience of some of the PI team members with the SDC ESAA case study project (see Wellisch, MacQueen, Carriere & Duck, 1978) provided a step in the direction of more qualitative research. It gave them experience looking at large amounts of data from a small number of sites, even though the data were largely quantitative. On the other hand, other studies in

the organization—most notably the Title I Sustaining Effects Study—were seen by some team members as spending a great deal of time and money to learn very little new. At least one member of the PI team noted that discontent with classical quantitative studies was "in the air" in the mid-1970s. Hence, there was a readiness to move somewhat away from purely quantitative studies, provided that the team could be shown that there was a rigorous way to do so.

The two senior researchers of the DESSI team came together after the contract was awarded to The Network. Matthew Miles, a social psychologist and educational change expert, was experienced in using both qualitative and quantitative methods. He had recently completed a multisite qualitative research project that was not formalized, was dissatisfied with its process, and was looking for alternatives (Miles, 1979). One of his first tasks as a consultant to The Network was to critique its plan for "ethnographic" research in the DESSI study. His memo drew on his own past experience and his knowledge of several other multisite studies that were low in formalization. It set the tone for what became the formalization of the DESSI qualitative study. His collaborator, Michael Huberman, was a cognitive psychologist familiar with Piagetian research techniques which he describes as "quantifiable even though numbers are rarely used." Their shared discontent with less formal approaches and their eclectic methodological background seem to have provided the basis for their inventing a more formalized approach.

The EBCE team had the strongest background in traditional qualitative field work. The senior member of the initial team, David Cohen, was an intellectual historian more interested in policy issues and theoretical development than methodological detail. Although he became less active

after the contract was awarded, the three team members, Eleanor Farrar, Peter Cowden, and John DeSanctis, had been his students. They obtained their field work experience while students largely by on-the-job training on projects he had attracted to the Huron Institute.

Unlike the four other teams, the initial CIP team had no substantial interest in qualitative methods prior to being awarded the CIP contract. The project director, Kasten Tallmadge, was trained as an experimental psychologist; his major assistant, Peter Treadway, was more interested in policy issues than any particular methodology. However, one of the ethnographers recruited through the initiative of the funding agency, David Fetterman, gained the trust of his two colleagues over time. He became an accepted member of the core team before the project ended.

Reference Groups and Advice Networks. Reference groups served to reinforce tendencies already alive within the research teams because individual members brought their reference groups with them. Thus, when one of the long-time SDC employees on PI explained that he had to justify what he saw as the relatively unstructured methodology being used to his more quantitative peers, the anthropologist countered that he had to explain the high amount of structure in the same project to his qualitative colleagues. Generally, however, PI team members felt the greatest need to justify themselves to their colleagues at SDC, who were primarily quantitative researchers. Their colleagues looked for evidence of procedural rigor and reliability in what they saw as a deviation from the norms of established scientific research. Thus, at SDC the internal reference group was a conservative force that pushed in the direction of increased formalization.

The DESSI team was also sensitive to a set of reference groups. While the study operated through a series of subcontracts and consulting

agreements that precluded identifying an "office context," the writings of senior staff make clear their interest in justifying their work to a larger audience concerned with matters of reliability and internal validity as defined by quantitative researchers (Document N). The EBCE team, however, presents a different picture. Its members belonged to an "invisible college" (Crane, 1972) organized around David Cohen and the Harvard Graduate School of Education. It included Jerome Murphy, Milbrey McLaughlin and Richard Elmore all of whom were strong advocates for the use of less structured research approaches in learning about policy-relevant phenomena. Canons of methodological rigor developed by quantitative researchers were much less of a concern to this group.

Advice networks play an especially important role when the project team is making a major departure from its usual mode of operating. Such departures were made by the PI and RES teams. The key external advice for PI came early on from Ray Rist who was known to the PI team through his involvement with an earlier study at SDC. His major contribution to the PI team was to provide it with a way to use local field workers to collect data in a form that would promote cross-site comparability. He showed how the combination of extensive initial training on research issues and field work methodology, frequent telephone consultation, and the use of open-ended instruments could provide adequate structure while allowing for the development of a rich description of each site. The legitimacy of this approach was later reinforced by another consultant to the PI study, Marilyn Gittell, a prominent researcher on community involvement in education. Still, concerns about cross-site comparability led the PI team to develop some instruments that were more closed-ended than Rist recommended in order to provide protection if his approach did not work. Later, when

the team needed continual advice on how to analyze qualitative data, they recruited Smith who was trained as a traditional ethnographer but was sympathetic to the formalization of qualitative research. He subsequently played a major role in implementing a highly formal approach.

The RES situation was somewhat different because the task of creating useful case studies rested with a cadre of onsite researchers who were not recruited until the project was underway. The project team had to find individuals who could operate productively under conditions of great autonomy, provide them with adequate organizational and intellectual support, and create enough confidence in the approach within Abt Associates and the funding agency to enable the researchers to function with minimal interference for three years, until drafts of their complete case studies were available for public review. The latter task was especially difficult because of fears that premature disclosure of case study data would compromise the ability of the onsite researchers to continue their field work (Document C). Although the on-site researchers at all ten sites were continually aware that they could become caught between the competing agendas of "locals and feds," in only one instance did this lead to serious conflict (see Messerschmidt, 1981).

Herriott's rural upbringing convinced him that research approaches developed in urban settings (such as the sociological community study) would be inappropriate for this project. He put together an advisory committee chaired by Harry Wolcott--an educational ethnographer--that also included three other anthropologists and a sociologist committed to highly individualistic field work (Howard Becker). Herriott's professional contacts were used to assemble this committee. It played an active role in selecting the on-site researchers, in reviewing organizational arrangements

designed to support them and in reviewing interim case study documents. It also provided some legitimation for the overall case study approach and reinforcement for the core team vis-a-vis the concerns of Abt Associates' management.

Research Team Recruitment. Taken together, these examples suggest that research teams develop a level of formalization that reflects their own predilections and reference groups more than it does the technical or contractual factors presented earlier. If this is true, then a key question is how are the research teams put together? Basically, they come from three sources. The most prominent is a reliance on people already in the "contract shop." Most of the staff of every project came from inside the contractor organization. (Herriott had an agreement to come to Abt that predated the RES proposal effort.) The one exception is DESSI which did not have an existing staff because this was to be The Network's first major research contract; prior to then it was primarily a technical assistance organization. However, inhouse availability merely sets the lower limits on the pool of available team members. Especially in larger organizations, such as Abt Associates and SDC, actual staffing decisions reflect the need of corporate managers to make the best allocation of internal staff as much as the requirements of specific proposals. Thus, the first PI project director at SDC was a person who had spent a number of years as number-two man on many projects. He was "due" for a shot at a directorship. Other staff were chosen because their existing projects were coming to an end. Most of the staff that Abt Associates proposed for the RES contract never played their stated roles because the company won another major contract at the same time. To accommodate the requirements of both projects, the staff

was split, with a number of quantitative psychologists who were less interested in an ethnographic approach moving to the other study.

The second mechanism of recruitment was the use of informal networks. These were often formalized through the use of project advisory committees. Neither Miles nor Huberman was initially proposed to do the DESSI ethnographic study; both were to serve in an advisory capacity. When it became apparent that the person proposed to do the qualitative study lacked the necessary experience with education and contract research and that Miles and Huberman had it, David Crandall—President of The Network and Director of the overall DESSI study—asked them to take a new role. Smith came to the PI study in a similar manner. Ward Keesling, a senior staff member on the PI project, served on an advisory committee for a project on which Smith then worked at another organization. Keesling was impressed with Smith's work and, when it became apparent that the PI project "needed an anthropologist," recommended that he be hired. Where formal advisory committees did not provide adequate linkages, invisible colleges often did. Thus, Crandall knew Miles and had used him as a consultant before DESSI began, and another DESSI advisory committee member known to Crandall—Ronald Havelock—had worked with Huberman. Similarly, all the field workers of the EBCE study—Eleanor Farrar, John DeSanctis, Richard Elmore, and Peter Cowden—had been students of David Cohen at various times and knew each other well.

Interestingly, these five project teams were rarely staffed through the recruitment of unaffiliated strangers. Although RES, PI, and DESSI all made extensive use of systematic recruitment to hire field researchers, informal ties played a role. One of the two junior field workers on DESSI had worked for Miles before. Four of the ten RES field workers were

recommended by members of its advisory committee or by professional colleagues of Herriott. However, none of these individuals became part of the central management or cross-site analysis teams on either project.

There is one other potential influence over recruitment, the federal sponsor. All five of these projects had within their contracts a standard "key personnel clause" which gives the sponsoring agency the right to approve all professional staff assignments. In general this approval was routinely granted, both for people proposed initially and those recruited later by the contractor. One notable exception, however occurred in the case of David Fetterman, the anthropologist who carried out the bulk of the ethnographic field work for the CIP team. Since the CIP study was to be a replication across four sites of an earlier single-site study which had a major ethnographic component, the federal sponsor insisted that the contractor recruit an experienced ethnographer. When RMC seemed unable to do this on its own, the federal project monitor intervened to the extent of first putting the project director in touch with the Spindlers at Stanford and later interviewing the two candidates whom the Spindlers recommended.

Maintaining Autonomy. Once it is assigned or recruited, what does the research team do to maintain its autonomy to determine the formalization level of a project? There are several resources and tactics that seem to be important. The first resource is the general reputation of key members of the research team. Miles, for instance, is well known as an expert in the planned change field and at the time of the DESSI study was experienced at working on federal contracts and as a consultant to the government. He seems to have brought a substantial store of credibility to that project. On earlier occasions, the DESSI project monitor had "viewed him in many group situations" and always found him "to be a very sensitive and sensible

person." Similarly, as noted above SDC had a very strong track record with the agency awarding the PI contract which gave them a basis of good will at the start of the contract. In addition, according to the project monitor, "SDC had in the past been good in knowing when they needed help and in bringing in people from the outside." The fact that their proposal mentioned Ray Rist as one of the people they would turn to in getting methodological counsel was seen as a real plus, for he was viewed by the initial project monitor as "someone who was being talked about at that time as knowing how to do case study research."

Second, while taking the course they thought technically best, the research teams tried to anticipate the concerns of the federal officials and thus avoid head-to-head confrontations. One project director explains that

> By the time the project officers were brought in, we had beaten the issue to death. We had considered all options and knew what we were doing so we could make a strong case for what we wanted.

This effort at anticipation characterizes most of the project directors.

Third, because these qualitative projects were usually embedded in larger endeavors, it was often possible to use other parts of the projects as distractions or buffers. Thus, when one monitor of RES wanted more formalization of its case study component, the project director could address his concern through its Organizational Change Study--a primarily quantitative survey of project implementation in all ten sites that combined questionnaire data with centrally structured information provided by onsite researchers (see Rosenblum & Louis, 1981). Similarly, the DESSI qualitative study seems to have been protected by other parts of the project. The centerpiece of this contract was a large survey of 146 school districts.

As this survey encountered a number of technical problems, it took up the major part of the project monitor's time. Since she had great confidence in the professional capability of Miles and Huberman, she devoted less attention to their more smoothly functioning part of the contract.

Fourth, distance and structural arrangements also buffered some studies. The 10 RES onsite researchers were dispersed from New Hampshire to Alaska so it was difficult to keep direct tabs on their work. Further, the director of RES intentionally minimized contact between the onsite researchers and federal officials as a way of maintaining the autonomy of the former. Similarly, the subcontracting arrangements on DESSI kept the case study team out of direct contact with the project monitor who worked primarily through the project's director. Of course buffering could also work the other way. A major problem on the CIP project was to convince the original team of the legitimacy of ethnography. Federal support for Fetterman gave him time to show what he could contribute.

Finally, project directors can horsetrade and strike deals to maintain a desired level of formalization. For example, the RES project director arranged to devote some of the resources allocated to the book-length case studies to a product that would have short-range utility for the agency and also demonstrate the competence of the onsite researchers. This product contained five chapter-length case studies written by onsite researchers to a common format. They were accompanied by cross-case syntheses by five well respected researchers and practitioners from different perspectives (Document B). After its publication as a book, this document provided visibility for Experimental Schools and its parent agency.

DISCUSSION

The introduction of multisite qualitative research to the policy world was part of the methodological eclecticism that characterized that field as it expanded rapidly in the 1970s. Although this design had its precursors in academic social science, it was largely an invention of federally-funded contract research (Herriott and Firestone, 1983). By the end of the 1970s, multisite qualitative studies were a fragile part of the policy research scene. There was clearly "something in the air" which made this type of study useful to federal research sponsors, but there was great ambiguity on the part of both sponsors and researchers on matters of study design and implementation. From a historical perspective, the formalization that took place in the 1970s was an adaptation to the demands of the policy context. Just as quantitative researchers were seeking to enrich their understanding by incorporating qualitative elements into their work (see, e.g., Cook and Reichardt, 1979) so qualitative researchers borrowed some techniques and invented others in order to address canons of good work widely accepted in the quantitative world (Smith and Louis, 1982).

Yet, the mix of short-term forces that influenced the amount of formalization in these five projects is somewhat surprising. The picture that comes through is not of a systematic effort to change the character of qualitative research to fit its new setting. Indeed, there seems to have been disagreements among both researchers and research sponsors on the importance of the then widely accepted quantitative standards of excellence (Rist, 1977). Instead, each project was designed through a process that most resembles a "garbage can model" of decision making (see Cohen, March, and Olsen, 1972). From this perspective research design decisions are not the product of rational deductions from explicit policy questions or

methodological canons (Martin, 1982). Rather they are the result of processes whereby decision makers come together under pressures of time and competing commitments and where their decisions depend primarily on the preconceived solutions and problems they bring to the decision setting.

Such appears to be the situation with respect to the five projects we studied. In general the requests for proposals (RFPs) we reviewed reveal a need to accommodate a wide range of political preferences and design possibilities within the funding agency without acknowledging either inherent incompatibilities or the fact that not everything called for could be accomplished at the suggested budget level. The proposals prepared in response to these RFPs reveal a reluctance of competitors to commit themselves to an explicit course of action, partially because of the ambiguity of the RFP but also for fear of alienating those who would be judging their capabilities to carry out the research. (Thus the need for the "intricate dance" referred to above.)

What the federal sponsor generally buys is not an explicit research design, but a general statement of organizational capability (current staff, preferred consultants, past work, etc). Only after a contract has been awarded, when the full range of considerations can be evaluated with relatively greater impunity, can concrete design decisions begin to be made. At this point the contractor's team gains the upper hand, first because it typically outweighs the federal sponsor's representatives in number, effort level, and technical expertise, and later because it has greater access to knowledge about the phenomenon under study and can argue that the sponsor's original assumptions about the phenomenon are no longer valid.

Still, the contractor's team often faces many difficult questions about how best to proceed. The definition and resolution of these issues is also subject to garbage-can forces that affect project staffing as well as internal activities. All the teams we studied were assembled through chaotic processes that resulted from the need to propose a credible staff on short notice while taking into account the existing commitments of current staff members. The network of weak ties between current staff and the larger world of policy researchers also affected the way recruitment decisions were made. In no case was the full team that eventually designed and implemented these five studies identified before the contract was awarded. Further, regardless of how or when a team was recruited, its members brought with them a variety of generic preferences about how to conduct research. When the proposal was being written these personal preferences began to affect the study's design, but they were largely subordinated to the shared goal of winning the contract. However, once that hurdle was overcome, both the general and specific elements of study design were subject to redefinition through negotiations within the research team.

In two respects, this garbage-can process is "messier" than one might like to believe the research design process should be. First, technical design considerations such as research purposes and the number of research sites have less impact on how the study is carried out than they would if there were widely accepted guidelines for how to carry out multisite qualitative studies. Second, the balance of influence between the federal sponsor and the contracting team is tilted more towards the latter group than ought to be the case according to the normative depictions of Baker (1975) and Coleman (1972).

Such messiness may be more healthy than pathological, however. It stems from three characteristics of qualitative contract research. First, qualitative research is inherently a "nonroutine technology" (see Perrow, 1967). Such a technology is particularly useful in situations where the rules for proceeding are unclear and there are many unanticipated and difficult to analyze events. Hence, the importance of "the researcher as instrument" (Sanday, 1979) and the difficulty of deriving a course of action primarily from technical considerations.

Second, multisite qualitative research is a relatively new enterprise that still requires a great deal of trial-and-error learning to be done well. One of our informants, a person formerly responsible for top-level research planning within the National Institute of Education, was highly understanding of the type of design inconsistencies that we found and skeptical of any attempt to develop a "textbook approach" to qualitative policy research. "How can one hope to produce a Campbell and Stanley (1966) [for multisite qualitative research]," he asked, "when the field has yet to discover its Fisher?" (Smith, personal communication, 1981). Although we observed much commitment on the part of the teams we studied to codifying, justifying, and communicating their craft (see especially Appendix D, Documents C, I, L & N), they have to date touched upon only a few of the many issues that need to be addressed in a comprehensive overview of the full range of design and implementation choices in multisite qualitative studies.

Finally, the organizational arrangements for conducting policy research are inherently unstable. At their core is an interorganizational arrangement, quite similar to the intergovernmental arrangements that were used for many of the social action programs of the 1960s and 1970s. There

is no reason to believe that such arrangements should provide substantially more federal control over the research implementation process than they did over the policy implementation process (Bardach, 1977). Moreover, each research project is a temporary system with different rhythms of events within its different components. As the federal project monitor responsible for this study put it, "contractor time is different from academic time, and both of those are different from the time of federal officials." As a result interest waxes and wanes at different times for federal officials and the research team, and the cast of characters--especially on the federal side--changes frequently and often dramatically. The greater stability and continuing interest of the contracting team tends to give it more influence over design decisions.

How do these observations to help assess the utility of highly formalized multisite qualitative studies? In some ways such an assessment is premature because this approach is still so new. We have seen useful research conducted at all three levels of formalization that we observed. Nevertheless, formalization, at least to a point, seems to have distinct advantages. The development of an initial conceptual framework and its operationalization through a series of open-ended instruments is extremely useful for ensuring comparability in data collection across sites and responsiveness to the original research issues identified by the client.

The more formal data reduction and analysis techniques also facilitate drawing conclusions. They provide a much more precise language through which members of a research team and reviewers from the sites studied can describe and debate conclusions about specific settings and then about cross-site patterns. This language forces the team to confront differences of perception so that conclusions can be "audited" (Lincoln and Guba,

1982), and the agreement of a group of well-informed experts becomes a major claim for the credibility of findings.

Whether these techniques constitute a major advance in the reliability and validity of qualitative research is more open to question. By themselves, they cannot constitute stronger "proof" for the uninformed reader. A great deal of researcher judgment goes into the development of the type of ratings utilized by both the PI and the DESSI teams--much more than goes into the numbers analyzed in survey or experimental studies. The reader must take it on faith that these judgements are correct. Typically, such judgements are less well justified in the final report of a highly formalized study than in that of research using a more traditional ethnographic approach where substantial excerpts from original field notes are shared with the reader. The authors of some formalized studies point out that case study materials are available for external audit, but these are generally difficult to use by individuals who did not do the original field work. In sum, techniques of formalization in multisite qualitative studies have advantages and disadvantages as means to bolster the credibility and utility of a research report. Their wider use will depend in part on time and cost implications. Because they are fairly expensive to employ, we venture the prediction that they will become an important part of the "tool kit" of multisite qualitative researchers without becoming the sine qua non of good practice.

The issue for those who commission and conduct qualitative policy research seems to be one of deciding how much formalization is appropriate under particular conditions. What is needed is not a textbook of the "best" way to do multisite qualitative research but a contingency approach to study design and implementation. As the field matures, such an approach

ought to give progressively more weight to the political and scientific imperatives generated by the policy issue itself (Cronbach, 1982) and less to the personal and professional priorities of the research team. However, this objective may be somewhat idealistic for both qualitative and quantitative research. If our observations about the world of policy research apply beyond the five projects we studied, further formalization of qualitative policy research will not be achieved quickly or without controversy. Hopefully, the experiences of the past decade have helped us to better understand its major elements.

NOTES

1. This paper has been prepared with support from the National Institute of Education under contract No. 400-80-0019. It does not, however, necessarily reflect the view of that agency. We are particularly indebted to Fritz Mulhauser of the Institute's staff for his unfailing facilitation of our research.

2. We are indebted to Miles (1979) for pointing us in this direction. Although he speaks of the "bureaucratization" of field work and Talmadge & Rasher (1981) refer to the "quantification" of qualitative data, we have chosen the term "formalization" to reflect a phenomenon broader than either data collection arrangements or data reduction techniques.

3. No effort was made to achieve a random sample of projects within each of the five relevant cells of Table 1. Instead we endeavored to select a sample representative of the field qualitative policy research in the 1970s by emphasizing variation on the following seven factors: the funding agency, the contractor organization, the date of contract award, the size of the contract, the length of the funding period, the previous experience of key federal monitors and the disciplinary background of key project staff. We also gave priority to projects that our informants in the snowball sampling process suggested were methodologically sophisticated. For comparable data on all 25 projects, see Appendix A.

4. The on-site researchers included Allan F. Burns, Charles A. Clinton, A. Michael Colfer, Carol J. Pierce Colfer, William L. Donnelly, Ronald P. Estes, Jr., William A. Firestone, Lawrence Hennigh, Stephen J.

Langdon, Donald A. Messerschmidt, Marilyn C. Richen, Charles I. Stannard and C. Thompson Wacaster. In addition to their case study reports these anthropologists and sociologists produced a lively literature on the stresses and strains of qualitative field work in the policy research setting--see Appendix D, Document A, for illustrative citations.

5. In those instances where the authority for our characterization is a public document, that document has been cited here and annotated in Appendix D. In all other instances we have relied on our interview notes.

REFERENCES

Baker, K. M. The new grantsmanship. The American Sociologist, 1975, 10, pp. 206-219.

Bardach, E. The implementation game: What happens after a bill becomes law. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1977.

Campbell, D. T. & Stanley, J. C. Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

Cohen, M., March, J. & Olsen, J. A garbage can model of organizational choice. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1972, 17, 1-25.

Coleman, J. S. Policy research in the social sciences. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press, 1972.

Cook, T. D. & Reichardt, C. S. (Eds.). Qualitative and quantitative methods in evaluation research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1979.

Crane, D. Invisible colleges: Diffusion of knowledge in scientific communities. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1972.

Cronbach, L. J. Designing evaluations of educational and social programs. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Firestone, W. A. & Dawson, J. A. Approaches to qualitative data analysis: Intuitive, procedural, and intersubjective. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, March, 1982.

Geer, B. First days in the field. In P. E. Hammond (Ed.) Sociologists at work. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967.

Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine, 1967.

Greenwood, P. W., Mann, D., & McLaughlin, M. W. Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. III: The process of change. Santa Monica: Rand, 1975.

Herriott, R. E. & Firestone, W. A. Multisite qualitative policy research in education: A study of recent federal experience. Concord, MA: Authors, 1982.

Herriott, R. E. & Firestone, W. A. Multisite qualitative policy research: Optimizing description and generalizability. Educational Researcher, 1983, 12(2), forthcoming.

Huberman, A. M. & Miles, M. B. Drawing vaild meaning for qualitative data: Some techniques of data reduction and display. Quality and Quantity: European American Journal of Methodology, 1983, 17, forthcoming.

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. Establishing dependability and confirmability in naturalistic inquiry through an audit. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New York, March 1982.

Louis, K. S. Multi-site/multi-method studies: An introduction. American Behavioral Scientist, 1982, 26, 1, 6-22.

Martin, J. A garbage can model of the organizational research process. In J. E. McGrath, J. Martin & R. Kulka (Eds.), Judgment calls in research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1982.

Messerschmidt, D. A. Constraints in government research: The anthropologist in a rural school district. In D. A. Messerschmidt (Ed.), Anthropologist at home in North America: Methods and issues in the study of one's own society. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Miles, M. B. Qualitative data as an attractive nuisance: The problem of analysis. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1979, 24, 590-601.

Perrow, C. A framework for the comparative analysis of organizations. American Sociological Review, 1967, 32, 194-208.

Riecken, H. W. & Boruch, R. F. (Eds.). Social experimentation. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Rist, R. C. On the relations among educational research paradigms: From disdain to detente. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 1977, 9(2), 42-49.

Rist, R. C. Blitzkrieg ethnography: On the transformation of a method into a movement. Educational Researcher, 1980, 9(2), 8-10.

Rosenblum, S. & Louis, K. S. Stability and change: Innovation in an educational context. New York: Plenum, 1981.

Sanday, P. R. The ethnographic paradigm(s). Administrative Science Quarterly, 1981, 24, 527-38.

Smith, A. G. & Louis K. S. (Eds.) Multimethod policy research: issues and applications. Special issue of American Behavioral Scientist, 1982, 26, 1-144.

Smith, Marshall S. Telephone interview with Robert E. Herriott, April 6, 1981.

Talmadge, H. & Rasher, S. P. Quantifying qualitative data: The best of both worlds. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, 1981.

Wellisch, J. B., MacQueen, A. H., Carriere, R. A. & Duck, G. A. School management and organization in successful schools (ESAA in-depth study schools), Sociology of Education, 1978, 51, 211-27.

Wolcott, H. F. How to look like an anthropologist without really being one. Practicing Anthropology, 1980, 3(2), 6-7, 56-59.

Yin, R. K. The case study crisis: Some answers. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1981, 26, 58-65.

PART IV -- APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. PROFILES OF 25 MULTISITE QUALITATIVE STUDIES

Information about the organization, design and implementation of 25 multisite qualitative policy research studies can be found in this appendix. Table A-1 presents a brief overview of the project within which each study was located. It is followed by a detailed "profile" for each project. Section I of each profile describes the total project. For those projects without distinct substudies (see item 12) Section II also presents details about the total project. However, for projects with distinct substudies, Section II describes only a single substudy. In general this substudy is the "most qualitative" one in its approach to data collection/reduction/analysis/reporting.

Explanatory notes for each generic item in the profile can be found in Appendix B.

Table A-1. Roster of 25 Federally-funded Policy Research Projects Having at Least One Primarily Qualitative Component.

ID	Project Title	Funding Agency	Contractor	Key Personnel
01	The Evolution of Performance Contracting in Five School Districts	HEW/ASPE	Rand	Hall Carpenter
02	Pilot State Dissemination Program Study	OE/NCEC	Columbia/ BASR	Sieber Louis
03	The Rural Experimental Schools Study	OE/ES NIE/ES	Abt Assoc	Herriott Fitzsimmons Kane
04	Federal Programs Suporting Educational Change	OE/OPBE	Rand	Berman McLaughlin
05	National Evaluation of Project Developmental Continuity	HEW/ACYF	High Scope	Love Powell Bond
06	Title I Allocation Demonstration Study	NIE	Abt Assoc	Vanecko Ames
07	Documentation and Technical Assistance in Urban Schools	NIE/SCPS	Ctr for New Schls	Wilson Runkel
08	Compensatory Education Study: Administration of Title I	NIE	Booz-Allen	Beaven Goettel
09	Case Studies in Science Education	NSF/DSE	Univ of Illinois	Stake Easley
10	Evaluation of Project Information Package Dissemination and Implementation	OE/OPBE	AIR/RMC	Campeau Binkley
11	A Study of Experienced-based Career Education	NIE/E&W	Huron	Farrar DeSanctis
12	Program Consolidation and the State Role in ESEA Title IV	OE/OPBE	Rand	McLaughlin McDonnell
13	Vocational Education Equity Study	OE/OPBE	AIR	Harrison
14	A Study of the R&D Utilization Program	NIE/DIP	Abt Assoc	Louis

Table A-1. (Continued)

ID	Project Title	Funding Agency	Contractor	Key Personnel
15	Longitudinal Implementation Study of PL 94-142	OE/BEH	SRI	Stearns
16	The Career Intern Program Study	NIE/T&L	RMC	Tallmadge Fetterman
17	The Teacher Corps Evaluation Study	OE/OED	SRI	Marciano Deslonde
18	The Youthwork National Policy Study	DOL/OYP	Cornell Univ	Rist
19	A Study of Dissemination Efforts Supporting School Improvement	OE/OED	The Network	Crandall Huberman Miles
20	A Study of Parental Involvement in Federal Programs	OE/OED	SDC	Melaragno Keesling Smith
21	District Use of Information	NIE/T&L OE/OED	Huron	Kennedy
22	Case Studies of Interorganizational Arrangements for Knowledge Utilization: I	NIE/DIP	Abt Assoc	Yin Qwaltney
23	Case Studies of Interorganizational Arrangements for Knowledge Utilization: II	NIE/DIP	American Univ	Havelock Huberman
24	Case Studies of Interorganizational Arrangements for Knowledge Utilization: III	NIE/DIP	TDR	Chin Herzog
25	A Descriptive Study of Significant Bilingual Instructional Features	NIE	Far West Lab	Tikunoff

Note: The 25 projects are in ID sequence from the earliest funded to the latest. See the following page for a glossary of funding agency abbreviations.

Table A-1. (Continued)

GLOSSARY OF FUNDING AGENCY ABBREVIATIONS

DOL/OYP	Department of Labor/Office of Youth Policy
HEW/ACYF	Department of Health, Education & Welfare/ Agency for Children, Youth and Families
HEW/ASPE	Department of Health, Education & Welfare/ Assistant Secretary for Planning & Evaluation
NIE	National Institute of Education
NIE/DIP	National Institute of Education/ Dissemination and Improvement of Practice
NIE/ES	National Institute of Education/ Experimental Schools Program
NIE/E&W	National Institute of Education/ Education and Work
NIE/SCPS	National Institute of Education/ School Capacity for Problem Solving
NIE/T&L	National Institute of Education/ Teaching and Learning
NSF/DSE	National Science Foundation/ Division of Science Education
OE/BEH	Office of Education/ Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
OE/ES	Office of Education/ Experimental Schools Program
OE/NCEC	Office of Education/ National Center for Educational Communication
OE/OED	Office of Education/ Office of Evaluation and Dissemination
OE/OPBE	Office of Education/ Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROJECT PROFILE

Section I

1. ID C1 2. Project Name The Evolution of Educational Performance Contracting in Five School Districts
3. Funding Agency HEW/ASPE (Contract No. HEW-OS-70-156)
4. Project Monitor a. Edward Glaseman Telephone (202) 245-0361
   b. _____ Telephone _____
5. Research Organization The Rand Corporation, 1700 Main Street, Santa Monica, CA 90406
6. Start 4/69 7. End 12/71
8. Duration 2.7 years
9. Total Budget $ 350 K
10. Project Director a. George Hall Telephone _____
    b. Margaret Carpenter-Huffman Telephone (213) 454-4279
11. Overall Research Design a. x qualitative study(ies) only
    b. ___ separate qualitative and quantitative substudies
    c. ___ integrated qualitative and quantitative substudy(ies)

12. Name of Distinct Substudies	13. Substudy Type	14. Principal Investigator	15. Appx. Budget
a. Review of Perf. Contracting	Q1	Stucker/Hall	$ 50 K
b. Case Studies	Q1/Qn	Carpenter/Hall	$ 250 K
c. Monograph	Q1/Qn	Carpenter et al.	$ 50 K
d.			$
e.			$

Section II (Case Studies of Performance Contracting)

16. Unit of Qualitative Study School District 17. No. of Units (C) 5

18. Modes of Field Research (C)
    a. 5 2 visits for 4 days per visit
    b. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
    c. - intermittent for ___ days over ___ mos.
    d. - continuous for ___ months

19. Structure of Field Research (C)
    a. 2 one person throughout
    b. - series of ___ sole persons
    c. 3 team of 2 persons
    d. - team of ___ persons

20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (R)
    a. 4 document acquisition
    b. - questionnaire administration
    c. - highly-structured interviewing
    d. 1 semi-structured interviewing
    e. - largely-unstructured interviewing
    f. - highly-structured observation
    g. - semi-structured observation
    h. 3 largely-unstructured observation
    i. 2 data acquisition from school files

21. Number of Field Workers (C) 5

22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (C)
    a. - anthropology
    b. 1 education
    c. - political science
    d. - psychology
    e. - sociology
    f. 3 other

23. Types of Public Unit-specific Narratives (C)
    a. - none
    b. - brief vignettes
    c. 5 chapter-length case studies
    d. - book-length case studies

24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s):
    a. Carpenter, Polly and George R. Hall. Case Studies in Educational Performance Contracting: Vol 1., Conclusions and Implications (Rand Report R-900/1 HEW). Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, 1971., 51 pp.
    b. Carpenter-Huffman, Margaret, George R. Hall and Gerald C. Sumner. Change in Education: Insights from Performance Contracting. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, 1974.

PROJECT PROFILE

Section I

1. ID 02 2. Project Name Pilot State Dissemination Program Study
3. Funding Agency OE/NCEC (Contract No. OEC-0-70-4930)
4. Project Monitor a. John Coulson Telephone (202) 254-5470
   b. _____ Telephone _____
5. Research Organization Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, New York, NY 10025
6. Start 9/70 7. End 6/72
8. Duration 1.8 years
9. Total Budget $ 450 K
10. Project Director a. Sam D. Sieber Telephone _____
    b. Karen Seashore Louis Telephone (617) 542-7037
11. Overall Research Design a. ___ qualitative study(ies) only
    b. ___ separate qualitative and quantitative substudies
    c. x integrated qualitative and quantitative substudy(ies)

12. Name of Distinct Substudies	13. Substudy Type	14. Principal Investigator	15. Appx. Budget
a. State Study	Ql/Qn	NA	$ 150 K
b. Linker Study	Ql/Qn	NA	$ 150 K
c. User Study	Qn	NA	$ 150 K
d.			$
e.			$

Section II: Linker Study

16. Unit of Qualitative Study School District 17. No. of Units (C) 12
18. Modes of Field Research (C)
    a. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
    b. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
    c. 12 intermittent for 35 days over 18 mos.
    d. - continuous for ___ months
19. Structure of Field Research (C)
    a. 2 one person throughout
    b. - series of ___ sole persons
    c. 1 team of 3 persons
    d. - team of ___ persons
20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (R)
    a. ___ document acquisition
    b. 4 questionnaire administration
    c. - highly-structured interviewing
    d. 1 semi-structured interviewing
    e. 2 largely-unstructured interviewing
    f. - highly-structured observation
    g. 3 semi-structured observation
    h. - largely-unstructured observation
    i. ___
21. Number of Field Workers (C) 5
22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (C)
    a. - anthropology
    b. - education
    c. - political science
    d. 1 psychology
    e. 1 sociology
    f. 3 other
23. Types of Public Unit-specific Narratives (C)
    a. ___ none
    b. - brief vignettes
    c. 12 chapter-length case studies
    d. - book-length case studies
24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s):

Louis, Karen Seashore and Sam D. Sieber. Bureaucracy and the Dispersed Organization. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 1979.

PROJECT PROFILE

Section I

1. ID 03 2. Project Name The Rural Experimental Schools Study
3. Funding Agency OE/ES then NIE/ES (Contract Nos. OEC-0-72-5245; 400-78-0034)
4. Project Monitor a. David Budding (1st) Telephone (617) 492-7100
   b. John Egermeier (7th) Telephone (202) 254-6050
5. Research Organization Abt Associates Inc.
   55 Wheeler Street
   Cambridge, MA 02138
6. Start 6/72 7. End 6/80
8. Duration 8.0 years
9. Total Budget $ 5.1 M
10. Project Director a. Robert E. Herriott Telephone (617) 369-9779
    b. _____ Telephone _____
11. Overall Research Design a. ___ qualitative study(ies) only
    b. X separate qualitative and quantitative substudies
    c. ___ integrated qualitative and quantitative substudy(ies)

12. Name of Distinct Substudies	13. Substudy Type	14. Principal Investigator	15. Appx. Budget
a. Site Case Studies	QL	Stephen J. Fitzsimmons	$ 2.0 M
b. Pupil Change Study	Qn/QL	Wendy Peter Abt	$ 1.2 M
c. Organizational Change Study	Qn/QL	Sheila Rosenblum	$ 0.8 M
d. Community Change Study	Qn/QL	Stephen J. Fitzsimmons	$ 0.5 M
e. Special Studies	QL	Robert E. Herriott	$ 0.6 M

Section II: Site Case Studies

16. Unit of Qualitative Study School District 17. No. of Units (C) 10
18. Modes of Field Research (C)
    a. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
    b. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
    c. 1 intermittent for 600 days over 30 mos.
    d. 9 continuous for 30 months (full-time)
19. Structure of Field Research (C)
    a. 8 one person throughout
    b. 1 series of 2 sole persons
    c. 1 team of 2 persons
    d. - team of ___ persons
20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (R)
    a. 3 document acquisition
    b. - questionnaire administration
    c. - highly-structured interviewing
    d. 4 semi-structured interviewing
    e. 2 largely-unstructured interviewing
    f. - highly-structured observation
    g. - semi-structured observation
    h. 1 largely-unstructured observation
    i. 5 still photography
21. Number of Field Workers (C) 12
22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (C)
    a. 8 anthropology
    b. 1 education
    c. - political science
    d. - psychology
    e. 3 sociology
    f. ___ _____
23. Types of Public Unit-specific Narratives (C)
    a. ___ none
    b. 10 brief vignettes
    c. 15 chapter-length case studies
    d. 8 book-length case studies
24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s):
    a. Herriott, Robert E. Federal Initiatives and Rural School Improvement: Findings from the Experimental Schools Program. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates Inc., 1980, 36 pp. (See Appendixes A, B, and C for bibliography of other reports.)
    b. Herriott, Robert E. "Tensions in Research Design and Implementation: The Rural Experimental Schools Study," American Behavioral Scientist, 1982, 26 (1), 23-44.
    c. Herriott, Robert E. and Neal Gross (Eds.). The Dynamics of Planned Educational Change: Case Studies and Analyses. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1979, 411 pp.

PROJECT PROFILE

Section I

1. ID 04 2. Project Name Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change
3. Funding Agency OE/OPBE (Contract No.)
4. Project Monitor a. Telephone
b. Anne Bezdak (Weinheimer) (2nd) Telephone (202) 245-8877
5. Research Organization The Rand Corporation
1700 Main Street
Santa Monica, CA 90406
6. Start 6/73 7. End 4/77
8. Duration 3.9 years
9. Total Budget $ 1.2 M
10. Project Director a. John Pincus (1st) Telephone (213) 393-0411
b. Paul Berman (2nd) Telephone
11. Overall Research Design a. ___ qualitative study(ies) only
b. x separate qualitative and quantitative substudies (Phase I)
c. x integrated qualitative and quantitative substudy(ies)(PhaseI

12. Name of Distinct Substudies	13. Substudy Type	14. Principal Investigator	15. Appx. Budget
a. Phase I National Survey	On	NA	$
b. Phase I Field Research	Ql		$
c. Phase II National Survey	On	NA	$
d. Phase II Field Research	Ql	NA	$
e.			$

Section II: Phase II Field Research (ESEA Title III & VII Projects)

16. Unit of Qualitative Study School District 17. No. of Units (C) 30

18. Modes of Field Research (C)
a. 30 1 visits for 4 days per visit
b. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
c. - intermittent for ___ days over ___ mos.
d. - continuous for ___ months

19. Structure of Field Research (C)
a. - one person throughout
b. - series of ___ sole persons
c. 30 team of 2 persons
d. - team of ___ persons

20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (R)
a. 3 document acquisition
b. - questionnaire administration
c. - highly-structured interviewing
d. 1 semi-structured interviewing
e. - largely-unstructured interviewing
f. - highly-structured observation
g. 2 semi-structured observation
h. ___ largely-unstructured observation
i. ___

21. Number of Field Workers (C) 15

22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (C) *
a. - anthropology
b. - education
c. 7 political science
d. 3 psychology
e. - sociology
f. ___

23. Types of Public Unit-specific Narratives (C)
a. x none
b. ___ brief vignettes
c. ___ chapter-length case studies
d. ___ book-length case studies

24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s):

Berman, Paul and Milbrey McLaughlin. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. VII: Factors Affecting Implementation and Continuation. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, 1977. (Rand Report No. R1589-7)

* Major emphasis upon the use of well-trained and experienced social scientists as field workers.

PROJECT PROFILE

Section I

1. ID 05 2. Project Name National Evaluation of Project Developmental Continuity
3. Funding Agency HEW/ACYF (Contract Nos. HEW 100-75-0833; HEW 105-78-1307)
4. Project Monitor a. Esther Kresh Telephone (202) 472-3594
   b. _____ Telephone _____
5. Research Organization High/Scope Ed. Res. Foundation
   600 N. River Street
   Ypsilanti, MI 48197
6. Start 11/74 7. End 5/82
8. Duration 7.5 years
9. Total Budget $ 2.0 M
10. Project Director a. John Love (1st) Telephone (203) 227-7201
    b. James T. Bond (3rd) Telephone (313) 485-2000
11. Overall Research Design a. ___ qualitative study(ies) only
    b. x separate qualitative and quantitative substudies
    c. ___ integrated qualitative and quantitative substudy(ies)

12. Name of Distinct Substudies	13. Substudy Type	14. Principal Investigator	15. Appx. Budget
a. Feas. & Impl. Study	Q1	Love, Smith	$ 0.6 M
b. Impact Study	Qn/Q1	Granville, Bond,	$ 1.4 M
c. _____	_____	Clement, Rosario,	$ _____
d. _____	_____	Wacker	$ _____
e. _____	_____	_____	$ _____

Section II: Impact Study

16. Unit of Qualitative Study PDC Site 17. No. of Units (C) 11
18. Modes of Field Research (C)
    a. 11 6 visits for 5 days per visit
    b. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
    c. - intermittent for ___ days over ___ mos.
    d. - continuous for ___ months
19. Structure of Field Research (C)
    a. 6 one person throughout
    b. 5 series of 2 sole persons
    c. - team of ___ persons
    d. - team of ___ persons
20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (R)
    a. 3 document acquisition
    b. - questionnaire administration
    c. - highly-structured interviewing
    d. 1 semi-structured interviewing
    e. - largely-unstructured interviewing
    f. - highly-structured observation
    g. 2 semi-structured observation
    h. - largely-unstructured observation
    i. ___ _____
21. Number of Field Workers (C) 16
22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (C)
    a. 4 anthropology
    b. 2 education
    c. - political science
    d. 8 psychology
    e. 2 sociology
    f. ___ _____
23. Types of Public Unit-specific Narratives (C)
    a. x none
    b. ___ brief vignettes
    c. ___ chapter-length case studies
    d. ___ book-length case studies
24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s):

Bond, J.T., Wacker, S., Clement, J., Halpern, R. & Rosario, J. Project Developmental Continuity Evaluation: Final Report, Volumes I and II. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, 1982.

PROJECT PROFILE

Section I

1. ID 06 2. Project Name Title I Allocation Demonstration Study
3. Funding Agency NIE/Title I Study Group (Contract No. 400-75-)
4. Project Monitor a. Anne Milne Telephone
b. Telephone
5. Research Organization Abt Associates Inc. 55 Wheeler Street Cambridge, MA 02138
6. Start 1/75 7. End 12/78
8. Duration 4.0 years
9. Total Budget $ 3.8 M
10. Project Director a. James Vanecko (1st) Telephone (617) 661-6508
b. Nancy Ames (2nd) Telephone (617) 492-7100
11. Overall Research Design a. ___ qualitative study(ies) only
b. ___ separate qualitative and quantitative substudies
c. x integrated qualitative and quantitative substudy(ies)

12. Name of Distinct Substudies	13. Substudy Type	14. Principal Investigator	15. Appx. Budget
a. Student-level Allocation	On	NA	$ 180OK
b. Parent Surveys	On	NA	$ 90OK
c. Implementation Study	Ql/On	Catherine Baltzell	$ 70OK
d. Cost Study	On	NA	$ 40OK
e.			$

Section II: Implementation Study

16. Unit of Qualitative Study School District 17. No. of Units (C) 13
18. Modes of Field Research (C)
a. 13 4 visits for 5 days per visit
b. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
c. - intermittent for ___ days over ___ mos.
d. - continuous for ___ months
19. Structure of Field Research (C)
a. - one person throughout
b. - series of ___ sole persons
c. 13 team of 2 persons
d. - team of ___ persons
20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (R)
a. 4 document acquisition
b. - questionnaire administration
c. 2 highly-structured interviewing
d. 1 semi-structured interviewing
e. - largely-unstructured interviewing
f. - highly-structured observation
g. 3 semi-structured observation
h. - largely-unstructured observation
i. ___
21. Number of Field Workers (C) 10
22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (C)
a. - anthropology
b. - education
c. - political science
d. 2 psychology
e. 3 sociology
f. 5 other
23. Types of Public Unit-specific Narratives (C)
a. ___ none
b. 13 brief vignettes
c. 13 chapter-length case studies
d. - book-length case studies
24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s):

Vanecko, James and Nancy Ames (with Francis Archambault). Who Benefits from Federal Education Dollars? Title I Allocation Policy. Cambridge, MA: Abt Books, 1979, 280 pp.

PROJECT PROFILE

Section I

1. ID 07 2. Project Name Documentation and Technical Assistance in Urban Schools
3. Funding Agency NIE/SCPS (Contract No. NIE-75-)
4. Project Monitor a. Frederick Mulhauser Telephone (202) 254-7930
   b. _____ Telephone _____
5. Research Organization Center for New Schools
   431 South Dearborn St.
   Chicago, IL 60605
6. Start 1/75 7. End 6/80
8. Duration 5.5 years
9. Total Budget $ 3.5 M
10. Project Director a. Thomas A. Wilson Telephone (312) 939-7025
    b. _____ Telephone _____
11. Overall Research Design a. x qualitative study(ies) only
    b. ___ separate qualitative and quantitative substudies
    c. ___ integrated qualitative and quantitative substudy(ies)

12. Name of Distinct Substudies	13. Substudy Type	14. Principal Investigator	15. Appx. Budget
a. Case Studies of Projects	QL	Steve Wilson/Phil Runkel	$ 1.8 M
b. Case Studies of TA Teams	QL	Don Moore/Dick Schmuck	$ 1.2 M
c. Development of Demo. Model	QL	Tom Wilson	$ 0.5 M
d.			$
e.			$

Section II: Case Studies of Projects

16. Unit of Qualitative Study School Change Project 17. No. of Units (C) 9
18. Modes of Field Research (C)
    a. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
    b. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
    c. - intermittent for ___ days over ___ mos.
    d. 9 continuous for 24 months (full-time)
19. Structure of Field Research (C)
    a. 6 one person throughout
    b. 3 series of 2 sole persons
    c. - team of ___ persons
    d. - team of ___ persons
20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (R)
    a. 3 document acquisition
    b. 7 questionnaire administration
    c. - highly-structured interviewing
    d. 6 semi-structured interviewing
    e. 2 largely-unstructured interviewing
    f. - highly-structured observation
    g. 4 semi-structured observation
    h. 1 largely-unstructured observation
    i. 5 still photography
21. Number of Field Workers (C) 11
22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (C)
    a. 3 anthropology
    b. - education
    c. - political science
    d. 4 psychology
    e. 4 sociology
    f. ___ _____
23. Types of Public Unit-specific Narratives (C)
    a. ___ none
    b. 12 brief vignettes
    c. - chapter-length case studies
    d. 9 book-length case studies
24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s):
    a. Smith, Louis M. and David C. Dwyer. Federal Policy in Action: A Case Study of an Urban Project. St. Louis, MO: Graduate Institute of Education, Washington University, October 1979, 509 pp.
    b. Miles, Matthew B. Linkage in a New Key: The DTA Experience. New York: Center for Policy Research, June 1980, 99 pp. (Contains references to many other DTA Study documents.)

PROJECT PROFILE

Section I

1. ID 08 2. Project Name Compensatory Education Study: Administration of Title I

3. Funding Agency NIE/Title I Study Group (Contract No. NIE-76-0057)

4. Project Monitor a. Donald W. Burnes Telephone (202) 254-6070)
b. _____ Telephone _____

5. Research Organization Booz-Allen & Hamilton, Inc.
1025 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

6. Start 2/76 7. End 5/77
8. Duration 0.8 years
9. Total Budget $ 850 K

10. Project Director a. Douglas Beaven Telephone (617) 423-4300
b. _____ Telephone _____

11. Overall Research Design a. ___ qualitative study(ies) only
b. X separate qualitative and quantitative substudies
c. ___ integrated qualitative and quantitative substudy(ies)

12. Name of Distinct Substudies	13. Substudy Type	14. Principal Investigator	15. Appx. Budget
a. State Survey (N = 50)	Qn	Douglas Beaven	$ 350 K
b. State Case Studies (N = 8)	Ql	Robert Goettal	$ 500 K
c. _____	_____	_____	$ _____
d. _____	_____	_____	$ _____
e. _____	_____	_____	$ _____

Section II: State Case Studies (conducted as a subcontract to Syracuse Univ. Res. Corp.)

16. Unit of Qualitative Study State Education Agency 17. No. of Units (C) 8*

18. Modes of Field Research (C)
a. 8 1 visits for 1 days per visit
b. 8 1 visits for 10 days per visit
c. - intermittent for ___ days over ___ mos.
d. - continuous for ___ months

19. Structure of Field Research (C)
a. - one person throughout
b. - series of ___ sole persons
c. 8 team of 2 persons
d. - team of ___ persons

20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (R)
a. 2 document acquisition
b. - questionnaire administration
c. - highly-structured interviewing
d. 1 semi-structured interviewing
e. - largely-unstructured interviewing
f. - highly-structured observation
g. - semi-structured observation
h. - largely-unstructured observation
i. ___ _____

21. Number of Field Workers (C) 10

22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (C)
a. - anthropology
b. 6 education
c. - political science
d. - psychology
e. 1 sociology
f. 3 public administration

23. Types of Public Unit-specific Narratives (C)
a. ___ none
b. - brief vignettes
c. 32 chapter-length case studies
d. 8 book-length case studies

24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s):

Goettel, Robert, Barnard A. Kaplan and Martin E. Orland (with the assistance of Pascal Forgione, Jr., and Sheila D. Huff). A Comparison of ESEA Title I in Eight States. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Research Corp., 1977, 256 pp.

* For each of the eight states qualitative field work was also conducted (and case study narratives written) within each of four illustrative school districts.

PROJECT PROFILE

Section I

1. ID 09 2. Project Name Case Studies in Science Education
3. Funding Agency NSF/DSE/OPI (Contract No. 76-21134)
4. Project Monitor a. Arlen Gullickson (2nd) Telephone
   b. Linda Ingison (3rd) Telephone
5. Research Organization University of Illinois, Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation, Urbana, IL 61801
6. Start 7/76 7. End 8/78
8. Duration 2.1 years
9. Total Budget $ 294 K
10. Project Directors a. Robert E. Stake Telephone (217) 333-3770
    b. Jack A. Easley, Jr. Telephone (217) 333-4382
11. Overall Research Design a. ___ qualitative study(ies) only
    b. x separate qualitative and quantitative substudies
    c. ___ integrated qualitative and quantitative substudy(ies)

12. Name of Distinct Substudies	13. Substudy Type	14. Principal Investigator	15. Appx. Budget
a. Case Studies (N=11)	QL	Robert E. Stake	$ 280 K
b. Validation Survey	Qn	Eliz. Dawson-Saunders	$ 14 K
c.			$
d.			$
e.			$

Section II: Case Studies

16. Unit of Qualitative Study High School 17. No. of Units (C) 11
18. Modes of Field Research (C)
    a. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
    b. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
    c. 7 intermittent for 32 days over 4 mos.
    d. 4 continuous for 3 months (½ time)
19. Structure of Field Research (C)
    a. 10* one person throughout
    b. - series of ___ sole persons
    c. 1 team of 2 persons
    d. - team of ___ persons
20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (R)
    a. 3 document acquisition
    b. - questionnaire administration
    c. - highly-structured interviewing
    d. - semi-structured interviewing
    e. 1 largely-unstructured interviewing
    f. - highly-structured observation
    g. - semi-structured observation
    h. 2 largely-unstructured observation
    i. 4 still photography
21. Number of Field Workers (C) 11*
22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (C)
    a. 3 anthropology
    b. 1 education
    c. - political science
    d. 4 psychology
    e. 2 sociology
    f. 1 other
23. Types of Public Unit-specific Narratives (C)
    a. ___ none
    b. 3 brief vignettes (10-20 pp.)
    c. 6 chapter-length case studies
    d. 2 book-length case studies
24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s):

    a. Stake, Robert A., Jack Easley and Associates. Case Studies in Science Education, Vols. 1 & 2. Washington, D.C. USGPO, July 1978. (Individual case studies available as booklets from National Technical Information Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, VA 22151 —NTIS Accession No. PB 282840.)

* One fieldworker covered two sites.

PROJECT PROFILE

Section I

1. ID 10 2. Project Name Evaluation of Project Information Package Dissemination and Implementation
3. Funding Agency OE/OPBE (Contract No. 300-76-0330)
4. Project Monitor a. Judith Burnes Telephone (202) 245-8195
   b. _____ Telephone _____
5. Research Organization American Institutes for Research, 1791 Arastradaro Road, Palo Alto, CA 94302
6. Start 7/76 7. End 1/79
8. Duration 2.5 years
9. Total Budget $ 800 K
10. Project Director a. Peggie Campeau (AIR) Telephone (415) 493-3550
    b. Joanne Binkley (RMC) Telephone (415) 941-9550
11. Overall Research Design a. ___ qualitative study(ies) only
    b. ___ separate qualitative and quantitative substudies
    c. x integrated qualitative and quantitative substudy(ies)

12. Name of Distinct Substudies	13. Substudy Type	14. Principal Investigator	15. Appx. Budget
a. Implementation Case Studies	QL/QN	NA	$ 500 K
b. Dissemination Case Studies	QL/QN	NA	$ 300 K
c.			$
d.			$
e.			$

Section II: Implementation Case Studies

16. Unit of Qualitative Study Sch. Dist. (& relevant schs.) 17. No. of Units (C) 18
18. Modes of Field Research (C)
    a. 6 4 visits for 2 days per visit
    b. 12 2 visits for 2 days per visit
    c. - intermittent for ___ days over ___ mos.
    d. - continuous for ___ months
19. Structure of Field Research (C)
    a. - one person throughout
    b. - series of ___ sole persons
    c. 18 team of 2 persons
    d. - team of ___ persons
20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (R)
    a. 4 document acquisition
    b. - questionnaire administration
    c. 2 highly-structured interviewing
    d. 2 semi-structured interviewing
    e. - largely-unstructured interviewing
    f. - highly-structured observation
    g. 2 semi-structured observation
    h. - largely-unstructured observation
    i. ___
21. Number of Field Workers (C) 6
22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (C)
    a. - anthropology
    b. - education
    c. - political science
    d. 4 psychology
    e. 2 sociology
    f. ___
23. Types of Public Unit-specific Narratives (C)
    a. x none
    b. ___ brief vignettes
    c. ___ chapter-length case studies
    d. ___ book-length case studies
24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s):

Campeau, Peggie, Joanne Binkley, Peter Treadway, Judith Appleby and Barbara Bessey, Final Report: Evaluation of Project Information Package Dissemination and Implementation. Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research, 1979, 120 pp.

Note: This project was the third in a series of three OPBE-funded studies of PIPs. The first study was conducted by the RMC Corp., the second by SRI Intnl. and RMC and this one by AIR with an important subcontract to RMC.

PROJECT PROFILE

Section I

1. ID 11 2. Project Name A Study of Experienced-Based Career Education
3. Funding Agency NIE/EGW (Contract No. 400-76-0163)
4. Project Monitor a. David Goodwin Telephone (202) 254-6070)
   b. _____ Telephone _____
5. Research Organization The Huron Institute
   123 Mount Auburn Street
   Cambridge, MA 02138
6. Start 10/76 7. End 9/80
8. Duration 4.0 years
9. Total Budget $ 600 K
10. Project Director a. Eleanor Farrar Telephone (617) 491-5450
    b. _____ Telephone _____
11. Overall Research Design a. ___ qualitative study(ies) only
    b. x separate qualitative and quantitative substudies
    c. ___ integrated qualitative and quantitative substudy(ies)

12. Name of Distinct Substudies	13. Substudy Type	14. Principal Investigator	15. Appx. Budget
a. EPCE Program Survey	Qn	NA	$ 40 K
b. SEA Policy Study	Ql	NA	$ 240 K
c. School Implementation Study	Ql	NA	$ 320 K
d.			$
e.			$

Section II: School Implementation Study

16. Unit of Qualitative Study School 17. No. of Units (C) 45

18. Modes of Field Research (C)
    a. 23 1 visit for 4-5 days per visit
    b. 22 2-3 visits for 4-5 days per visit
    c. - intermittent for ___ days over ___ mos.
    d. - continuous for ___ months

19. Structure of Field Research (C)
    a. - one person throughout
    b. - series of ___ sole persons
    c. 45 team of 2 persons
    d. - team of ___ persons

20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (R)
    a. 4 document acquisition
    b. - questionnaire administration
    c. - highly-structured interviewing
    d. 3 semi-structured interviewing
    e. 1 largely-unstructured interviewing
    f. - highly-structured observation
    g. 2 semi-structured observation
    h. - largely-unstructured observation
    i. ___ _____

21. Number of Field Workers (C) 3

22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (C)
    a. - anthropology
    b. - education
    c. 3 political science
    d. - psychology
    e. - sociology
    f. ___ _____

23. Types of Public Unit-specific Narratives (C)
    a. x none
    b. ___ brief vignettes
    c. ___ chapter-length case studies
    d. ___ book-length case studies

24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s):

Farrar, Eleanor, John E. DeSanctis and David K. Cohen. "Views from Below: Implementation Research in Education," Teachers College Record (Fall 1980), pp. 77-100.

PROJECT PROFILE

Section I

1. ID 12 2. Project Name Program Consolidation and the State Role in ESEA Title IV
3. Funding Agency OE/OPBE (Contract No. 300-77-0515)
4. Project Monitor a. Penrose Jackson Telephone (Deceased)
   b. Anne Bezdek Weinheimer Telephone (202) 245-8877
5. Research Organization The Rand Corporation
   1700 Main Street
   Santa Monica, CA 90406
6. Start 9/77 7. End 1/79
8. Duration 1.3 years
9. Total Budget $ 700 K
10. Project Director a. Milbrey McLaughlin Telephone (213) 393-0411
    b. Telephone
11. Overall Research Design a. ___ qualitative study(ies) only
    b. ___ separate qualitative and quantitative substudies
    c. x integrated qualitative and quantitative substudy(ies)

12. Name of Distinct Substudies	13. Substudy Type	14. Principal Investigator	15. Appx. Budget
a. SEA Survey (N = 50)	Qn	NA	$
b. LEA Survey (N = 600)	Qn	NA	$
c. Field Research	Ql	NA	$ 275 K
d.			$
e.			$

Section II: Field Research

16. Unit of Qualitative Study State Education Agency 17. No. of Units (C) 8

18. Modes of Field Research (C)
    a. 8 1 visits for 5 days per visit*
    b. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
    c. - intermittent for ___ days over ___ mos.
    d. - continuous for ___ months

19. Structure of Field Research (C)
    a. - one person throughout
    b. - series of ___ sole persons
    c. 8 team of 2 persons
    d. - team of ___ persons

20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (R)
    a. 3 document acquisition
    b. - questionnaire administration
    c. - highly-structured interviewing
    d. 1 semi-structured interviewing
    e. 5 largely-unstructured interviewing
    f. - highly-structured observation
    g. 2 semi-structured observation
    h. 4 largely-unstructured observation
    i. ___

21. Number of Field Workers (C) 11

22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (C)**
    a. - anthropology
    b. 4 education
    c. 5 political science
    d. 2 psychology
    e. - sociology
    f. ___

23. Types of Public Unit-specific Narratives (C)
    a. x none
    b. ___ brief vignettes
    c. ___ chapter-length case studies
    d. ___ book-length case studies

24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s):

McDonnell, Lorraine M. and Milbrey W. McLaughlin (with the assistance of Millicent Cox, Richard F. Elmore, Christopher Myers and Gail Zellman). Program Consolidation and the State Role in ESEA Title IV. Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation, April 1980, 119 pp.

* Fieldwork was conducted both in the state capitol and in three school districts.

** Major emphasis upon the use of well-trained and experienced social scientists as fieldworkers.

PROJECT PROFILE

Section I

1. ID 13 2. Project Name Vocational Education Equity Study
3. Funding Agency OE/OPBE (Contract No. 300-77-0318)
4. Project Monitor a. Dorothy Shuler Telephone (202) 245-8877
   b. _____ Telephone _____
5. Research Organization American Institutes for Research
   1791 Arastradero Road
   Palo Alto, CA 94302
6. Start 9/77 7. End 6/79
8. Duration 1.8 years
9. Total Budget $ 904 K
10. Project Director a. Laurie Harrison Telephone (415) 493-3550
    b. _____ Telephone _____
11. Overall Research Design a. ___ qualitative study(ies) only
    b. x separate qualitative and quantitative substudies
    c. ___ integrated qualitative and quantitative substudy(ies)

12. Name of Distinct Substudies	13. Substudy Type	14. Principal Investigator	15. Appx. Budget
a. Exemplary Case Studies	QL	NA	$ 200 K
b. Primary Data Collection	Qn	NA	$ 600 K
c. Literature Review	NA	NA	$ 100 K
d.			$
e.			$

Section II: Exemplary Case Studies

16. Unit of Qualitative Study Local Voc. Ed. Program 17. No. of Units (C) 12
18. Modes of Field Research (C)
    a. 12 1 visits for 3 days per visit
    b. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
    c. - intermittant for ___ days over ___ mos.
    d. - continuous for ___ months
19. Structure of Field Research (C)
    a. 12 one person throughout
    b. - series of ___ sole persons
    c. - team of ___ persons
    d. - team of ___ persons
20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (R)
    a. 3 document acquisition
    b. - questionnaire administration
    c. - highly-structured interviewing
    d. 1 semi-structured interviewing
    e. - largely-unstructured interviewing
    f. - highly-structured observation
    g. 2 semi-structured observation
    h. - largely-unstructured observation
    i. ___
21. Number of Field Workers (C) 6
22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (C)
    a. - anthropology
    b. - education
    c. - political science
    d. 5 psychology
    e. - sociology
    f. 1 economics
23. Types of Public Unit-specific Narratives (C)
    a. ___ none
    b. 12 brief vignettes (appx. 20 pp.)
    c. - chapter-length case studies
    d. - book-length case studies
24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s):

Wheeler, Jenette B. and Associates. Vocational Education Equity Study, Vol. 3: Case Studies and Promising Approaches. Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research, March 1979, 300 pp.

PROJECT PROFILE

Section I

1. ID 14 2. Project Name A Study of the R&D Utilization Program
3. Funding Agency NIE/DIP (Contract No. 400-78-0002)
4. Project Monitor a. Mary Ann Milsap (1st) Telephone (617) 497-0541
   b. John Egermeier (3rd) Telephone (202) 254-6050
5. Research Organization Abt Associates Inc.
   55 Wheelar Street
   Cambridge, MA 02138
6. Start 11/77 7. End 6/81
8. Duration 3.5 years
9. Total Budget $ 1.8 M
10. Project Director a. Karen Seashore Louis Telephone (617) 956-1150
    b. Telephone
11. Overall Research Design a. ___ qualitative study(ies) only
    b. ___ separate qualitative and quantitative substudies
    c. x integrated qualitative and quantitative substudy(ies)

12. Name of Distinct Substudies	13. Substudy Type	14. Principal Investigator	15. Appx. Budget
a. School Study	Q1=Qn	NA	$ 1.2 M
b. Project Study	Q1/Qn	NA	$ 0.3 M
c. Linking Agent Study	Qn/Q1	NA	$ 0.3 M
d.			$
e.			$

Section II: School Study (Site Visit Sample Only)*

16. Unit of Qualitative Study School 17. No. of Units (C) 51
18. Modes of Field Research (C)
    a. 30 2 visits for 1-2 days per visit
    b. 21 1 visits for 2 days per visit
    c. - intermittent for ___ days over ___ mos.
    d. - continuous for ___ months
19. Structure of Field Research (C)
    a. - one person throughout
    b. - series of ___ sole persons
    c. 51 team of 2 persons
    d. - team of ___ persons
20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (R)
    a. 2 document acquisition
    b. - questionnaire administration
    c. 3 highly-structured interviewing
    d. 1 semi-structured interviewing
    e. - largely-unstructured interviewing
    f. - highly-structured observation
    g. - semi-structured observation
    h. - largely-unstructured observation
    i. ___
21. Number of Field Workers (C) 8
22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (C)
    a. - anthropology
    b. 1 education
    c. - political science
    d. 1 psychology
    e. 4 sociology
    f. 2 other
23. Types of Public Unit-specific Narratives (C)
    a. ___ none
    b. 30 brief vignettes
    c. 2 chapter-length case studies
    d. - book-length case studies
24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s):
    a. Louis, Karen S., Sheila Rosenblum and James Molitor. Linking R&D with Local Schools: Strategies for School Improvement. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates Inc., 1981, 280 pp.
    b. Louis, Karen S. "Sociologist as Sleuth: Integrating Methods in the RDU Study," American Behavioral Scientist, 1982, 26(1), 101-120.

* The School Study used three data collection approaches. 48 schools were studied only through site visits. 39 were studied only through intermittent field work totaling 8 days during a 12-month period. 3 schools were studied both ways.

PROJECT PROFILE

Section I

1. ID 15 2. Project Name Longitudinal Implementation Study of PL 94-142
3. Funding Agency OE/BEH then DE/OSE (Contract No. 300-78-0030)
4. Project Monitor a. Louis Danielson (2nd) Telephone
   b. Martin Kaufman (3rd) Telephone (202) 472-4652
5. Research Organization SRI International
   333 Ravenswood Ave.
   Menlo Park, CA 94025
6. Start 1/78 7. End 10/82
8. Duration 4.7 years
9. Total Budget $ 1.5 M
10. Project Director a. Marian Stearns Telephone (415) 859-3997
    b. Telephone
11. Overall Research Design a. x qualitative study(ies) only
    b. separate qualitative and quantitative substudies
    c. integrated qualitative and quantitative substudy(ies)

12. Name of Distinct Substudies	13. Substudy Type	14. Principal Investigator	15. Appx. Budget
a. (None)			$
b.			$
c.			$
d.			$
e.			$

Section II

16. Unit of Qualitative Study School District 17. No. of Units (C) 22
18. Modes of Field Research (C)
    a. 16 6 visits for 4 days per visit
    b. 6 4 visits for 4 days per visit
    c. - intermittent for ___ days over ___ mos.
    d. - continuous for ___ months
19. Structure of Field Research (C)
    a. - one person throughout
    b. - series of ___ sole persons
    c. 22 team of 2 persons
    d. - team of ___ persons
20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (R)
    a. 2 document acquisition
    b. - questionnaire administration
    c. - highly-structured interviewing
    d. 1 semi-structured interviewing
    e. - largely-unstructured interviewing
    f. - highly-structured observation
    g. - semi-structured observation
    h. 3 largely-unstructured observation
    i. ___
21. Number of Field Workers (C) 8
22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (C)
    a. - anthropology
    b. 5 education
    c. - political science
    d. 2 psychology
    e. - sociology
    f. 1 other
23. Types of Public Unit-specific Narratives (C)
    a. ___ none
    b. 5 brief vignettes
    c. - chapter-length case studies
    d. - book-length case studies
24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s):

Stearns, Marian, David Greene and Jane L. David. Local Implementation of PL 94-142: Report of the First Year of Longitudinal Study. Menlo Park, CA: SRI International, April 1980, 100 pp.

PROJECT PROFILE

Section I

1. ID 16 2. Project Name The Career Intern Program Study
3. Funding Agency NIE/TL for DOL (Contract No. 400-78-0021)
4. Project Monitor a. Howard M. Lesnick (1st) Telephone
   b. Daniel P. Antonopolos (2nd) Telephone (202) 254-6271
5. Research Organization RMC Research Corporation
   2570 El Camino Real
   Mountain View, CA 94025
6. Start 2/78 7. End 8/81
8. Duration 2.5 years
9. Total Budget $ 1.0 M
10. Project Director a. G. Kasten Tallmadge Telephone (415) 941-9550
    b. Telephone
11. Overall Research Design a. ___ qualitative study(ies) only
    b. x separate qualitative and quantitative substudies
    c. ___ integrated qualitative and quantitative substudy(ies)

12. Name of Distinct Substudies	13. Substudy Type	14. Principal Investigator	15. Appx. Budget
a. Implementation	Ql/Qn	Peter Treadway	$ 300 K
b. Psychological Outcomes	Qn	G. Kasten Tallmadge	$ 300 K
c. Impl.-Outcomes Relations	Ql	David Fetterman	$ 300 K
d. Other Similar Programs	Ql/Qn	G. Kasten Tallmadge	$ 100 K
e.			$

Section II (Implementation-Outcomes Relationships)

16. Unit of Qualitative Study Career Intern Program Site 17. No. of Units (C) 4
18. Modes of Field Research (C)
    a. 4 7 visits for 10 days per visit (over 2 yrs.)
    b. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
    c. - intermittant for ___ days over ___ mos.
    d. - continuous for ___ months
19. Structure of Field Research (C)
    a. - one person throughout
    b. - series of ___ sole persons
    c. 4 team of 2 persons
    d. - team of ___ persons
20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (R)
    a. 5 document acquisition
    b. 6 questionnaire administration
    c. - highly-structured interviewing
    d. 2 semi-structured interviewing
    e. 4 largely-unstructured interviewing
    f. - highly-structured observation
    g. 2 semi-structured observation
    h. 2 largely-unstructured observation
    i. ___
21. Number of Field Workers (C) 5
22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (C)
    a. 1 anthropology
    b. 2 education
    c. - political science
    d. 2 psychology
    e. - sociology
    f. ___
23. Types of Public Unit-specific Narratives (C)
    a. - none
    b. 4 brief vignettes (on many topics)
    c. 4 chapter-length case studies (1 topic)
    d. - book-length case studies
24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s):
    a. Fetterman, D.M. Study of the Career Intern Program. Final report—Task C: Program dynamics: Structure, function and interrelationships. Mountain View, CA: RMC Research Corporation, 1981.
    b. Fetterman, D.M. Ethnographic techniques in educational evaluation: An illustration. In A. VanFleet (Ed.) Anthropology of education: Methods and applications. Journal of Thought (special topic edition) 1980, 15(3), 31-48.
    c. Fetterman, D.M. Blaming the victim: The problem of evaluation design and federal involvement and reinforcing world views in education. Human Org., 1981, 40(1), 67-77.

PROJECT PROFILE

Section I

1. ID 17 2. Project Name Teacher Corps Evaluation Study
3. Funding Agency OE/OED (Contract No. 300-78-0289)
4. Project Monitor a. Eugene Tucker Telephone (202) 245-8380
   b. _____ Telephone _____
5. Research Organization SRI International, 333 Ravenswood Ave., Menlo Park, CA 94025
6. Start 8/78 7. End 7/81
8. Duration 5.0 years
9. Total Budget $ 5.0M
10. Project Director a. Richard A. Marciano Telephone (415) 859-3613
    b. _____ Telephone _____
11. Overall Research Design a. ___ qualitative study(ies) only
    b. x separate qualitative and quantitative substudies
    c. ___ integrated qualitative and quantitative substudy(ies)

12. Name of Distinct Substudies	13. Substudy Type	14. Principal Investigator	15. Appx. Budget
a. Implementation Study I	QL	James L. Deslonde	$ 210K
b. Implementation Study II	QL	David Beers	$
c. Staff Development Study	QL/Qn	Nick Stayrook	$
d. Instit. of TC Practices	QL	Bush/Fox	$
e. Dissem. of TC Practices	Qn/QL	Doug Hall	$
f. Teacher Development	Qn	Terry Middleton	$

Section II: Implementation Study I

16. Unit of Qualitative Study Teacher Corps Project 17. No. of Units (C) 4
18. Modes of Field Research (C)
    a. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
    b. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
    c. 4 intermittent for 60 days over 12 mos.
    d. - continuous for ___ months
19. Structure of Field Research (C)
    a. 3 one person throughout
    b. 1 series of 2 sole persons
    c. - team of ___ persons
    d. - team of ___ persons
20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (R)
    a. 3 document acquisition
    b. - questionnaire administration
    c. - highly-structured interviewing
    d. - semi-structured interviewing
    e. 1.5 largely-unstructured interviewing
    f. - highly-structured observation
    g. - semi-structured observation
    h. 1.5 largely-unstructured observation
    i. ___ _____
21. Number of Field Workers (C) 4
22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (C)
    a. 1 anthropology
    b. 2 education
    c. - political science
    d. - psychology
    e. 1 sociology
    f. ___ _____
23. Types of Public Unit-specific Narratives (C)
    a. ___ none
    b. 4 brief vignettes (in Vol. I)
    c. 4 chapter-length case studies (Vol. II)
    d. - book-length case studies
24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s):
    a. Deslonde, James L. (with Christine R. Finnan). Teacher Corps: An Implementation Study of Collaboration and Multicultural Education (Vol. I: Overview and Cross-Project Analysis). Menlo Park, CA: SRI International, 1980, 89 pp.
    b. Deslonde, James L., Christine R. Finnan and Daniel G. Broussard. Teacher Corps: An Implementation Study of Collaboration and Multicultural Education (Vol. II: Four Case Studies). Menlo Park, CA: SRI International, 1980, 170 pp.

PROJECT PROFILE

Section I

1. ID 18 2. Project Name Youthwork National Policy Study
3. Funding Agency Youthwork Inc. (as a contractor to DOL/OYP)
4. Project Monitor a. Lois-Ellin Data (1st) Telephone (202) 254-6000
   b. Michael Langsdorf (7th) Telephone (800) 424-9529
5. Research Organization Cornell University
   N.Y.S. College of Human Ecology
   Ithaca, N.Y. 14853
6. Start 8/78 7. End 9/80
8. Duration 2.1 years
9. Total Budget $ 1.0 M
10. Project Director a. Ray C. Rist Telephone (202) 275-0200
    b. Telephone
11. Overall Research Design a. x qualitative study(ies) only
    Note: YNPS was imbedded b. ___separate qualitative and quantitative substudies
    in a larger program of c. ___integrated qualitative and quantitative substudy(ies)
    research involving b & c.

12. Name of Distinct Substudies	13. Substudy Type	14. Principal Investigator	15. Appx. Budget
a. (None)			$
b.			$
c.			$
d.			$
e.			$

Section II

16. Unit of Qualitative Study In-school Youth Project 17. No. of Units (C) 60
18. Modes of Field Research (C)
    a. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
    b. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
    c. - intermittent for ___ days over ___ mos.
    d. 60 continuous for 22 months(part-time)
19. Structure of Field Research (C)
    a. 60 one person throughout
    b. - series of ___ sole persons
    c. - team of ___ persons
    d. - team of ___ persons
20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (R)
    a. 6 document acquisition
    b. 5 questionnaire administration
    c. - highly-structured interviewing
    d. 1 semi-structured interviewing
    e. 3 largely-unstructured interviewing
    f. - highly-structured observation
    g. 2 semi-structured observation
    h. 4 largely-unstructured observation
    i. ___
21. Number of Field Workers (C) 60
22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (C)
    a. 5 anthropology
    b. 30 education
    c. - political science
    d. 15 psychology
    e. 10 sociology
    f. ___
23. Types of Public Unit-specific Narratives (C)
    a. x none
    b. ___ brief vignettes
    c. ___ chapter-length case studies
    d. ___ book-length case studies
24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s):
    a. See entire issue of Children and Youth Services Review (Vol 2, No. 1, 1980)
    b. Bridging the Gap: Policy Strategies for Earning and Learning, Sage, 1981
    c. Confronting Youth Unemployment in the 1980s, Pergamon Press, 1980.
    d. National Agendas and Local Initiatives: Perspectives on Youth Unemployment Programs, SUNY Press, 1982.

PROJECT PROFILE

Section I

A Study of Dissemination Efforts

1. ID 19 2. Project Name Supporting School Improvement

3. Funding Agency OE/OED then DE/OPE (Contract No. 300-78-0527)

4. Project Monitor a. Ann Bezdek Weinheimer Telephone (202) 245-8877

b. _____ Telephone _____

5. Research Organization The Network Inc.
290 South Main Street
Andover, MA 01810

6. Start 10/78 7. End 10/81

8. Duration 3.0 years

9. Total Budget $ 3.0 M

10. Project Director a. David Crandall (P.I.) Telephone (617) 470-1080

b. Charles Thompson (P.D.) Telephone (617) 470-1080

11. Overall Research Design
a. ___ qualitative study(ies) only
b. ___ separate qualitative and quantitative substudies
c. X integrated qualitative and quantitative substudy(ies)

12. Name of Distinct Substudies	13. Substudy Type	14. Principal Investigator	15. Appx. Budget
a. School Survey	Qn/Ql	David Crandall	$1800K
b. Program Studies	Ql	Charles Thompson	$ 400K
c. External Agent Study	Qn	Ronald Havelock	$ 300K
d. School Case Studies	Ql	Huberman/Miles	$ 200K
e. State Case Studies	Ql	Glenn Shive	$ 200K

Section II: School Case Studies

16. Unit of Qualitative Study School 17. No. of Units (C) 12

18. Modes of Field Research (C)
a. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
b. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
c. 12 intermittent for 8 days over 6 mos.
d. - continuous for ___ months

19. Structure of Field Research (C)
a. 11 one person throughout
b. - series of ___ sole persons
c. 1 team of 2 persons
d. ___ team of ___ persons

20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (R)
a. 4 document acquisition
b. 5 questionnaire administration
c. 2.5 highly-structured interviewing
d. 1 semi-structured interviewing
e. - largely-unstructured interviewing
f. - highly-structured observation
g. 2.5 semi-structured observation
h. - largely-unstructured observation
i. ___

21. Number of Field Workers (C) 4

22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (C)
a. - anthropology
b. - education
c. - political science
d. 1 psychology
e. 1 sociology
f. 2 other

23. Types of Public Unit-specific Narratives (C)
a. ___ none
b. - brief vignettes
c. 8 chapter-length case studies
d. 4 book-length case studies

24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s):

a. Huberman, A. M. and M. B. Miles. How School Improvement Works: A Field Study of 12 Sites. Andover, MA: The Network, Inc., 1982.

b. Huberman, A. M. and M. B. Miles. "Drawing Valid Meaning from Qualitative Data: Some Techniques of Data Reduction and Display," Quality and Quantity, 1982, 16(6).

PROJECT PROFILE

Section I

1. ID 20 2. Project Name A Study of Parental Involvement in Federal Education Programs
3. Funding Agency OE/OED then DE/OPE (Contract No. 300-78-0437)
4. Project Monitor a. Daniel G. Ozenne Telephone (213) 689-2345
   b. Gerald Burns Telephone (202) 245-9401
5. Research Organization System Development Corporation, 2500 Colorado Avenue, Santa Monica, CA 90406
6. Start 10/78 7. End 7/81
8. Duration 2.8 years
9. Total Budget $2.0 M
10. Project Director a. Raymond B. Stewart Telephone (213) 820-4111
    b. J. Ward Keesling, Ralph J. Melaragno Telephone (213) 820-4111
11. Overall Research Design a. ___ qualitative study(ies) only
    b. x separate qualitative and quantitative substudies
    c. ___ integrated qualitative and quantitative substudy(ies)

12. Name of Distinct Substudies	13. Substudy Type	14. Principal Investigator	15. Appx. Budget
a. Site Study	Ql/Qn	NA	$1.5 M
b. Federal Programs Survey	Qn	NA	$0.5 M
c.			$
d.			$
e.			$

Section II: Site Study

16. Unit of Qualitative Study Local Project* 17. No. of Units (C) 57
18. Modes of Field Research (C)
    a. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
    b. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
    c. - intermittent for ___ days over ___ mos.
    d. 57 continuous for 4 months (½ time)
19. Structure of Field Research (C)
    a. 57 one person throughout
    b. - series of ___ sole persons
    c. - team of ___ persons
    d. - team of ___ persons
20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (R)
    a. 4 document acquisition
    b. - questionnaire administration
    c. - highly-structured interviewing
    d. 1.5 semi-structured interviewing
    e. 1.5 largely-unstructured interviewing
    f. - highly-structured observation
    g. 5 semi-structured observation
    h. 3 largely-unstructured observation
    i. ___
21. Number of Field Workers (C) 57
22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (C)
    a. 4 anthropology
    b. 4 education
    c. - political science
    d. 20 psychology
    e. 4 sociology
    f. 25 other
23. Types of Public Unit-specific Narratives (C)
    a. ___ none
    b. - brief vignettes
    c. - chapter-length case studies
    d. - book-length case studies
24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s):
    Lee, Dean R., J. Ward Keesling & Ralph J. Melaragno (Eds.). Parents and Federal Educational Programs, Volume 7: Methodologies Employed in the Study of Parental Involvement. Santa Monica, CA: System Development Corporation, 1981, 115 pp.

* A "local project" consisted of a central project office and two of the various schools participating in that project. The 57 projects were associated with one of four federal programs: Follow Through, ESSA, Title I, Title VII. Cross-site analyses were conducted both within each of the four programs and across them.

PROJECT PROFILE

Section I

1. ID 21 2. Project Name District Use of Information
3. Funding Agency NIE/TL & OE/OPBE (Contract No. 400-79-0061)
4. Project Monitor a. Mary Ann Millsap (NIE) / Janice Anderson (OE) Telephone (617) 497-0541 / (202) 245-8195
   b. Norman Gold (NIE) Telephone (202) 254-6271
5. Research Organization Huron Institute, 123 Mt. Auburn Street, Cambridge, MA 02138
6. Start 9/79 7. End 8/82
8. Duration 3.0 years
9. Total Budget $ 590 K
10. Project Director a. Mary Kennedy Telephone (617) 491-5454
    b. Telephone
11. Overall Research Design a. x qualitative study(ies) only
    b. ___ separate qualitative and quantitative substudies
    c. ___ integrated qualitative and quantitative substudy(ies)

12. Name of Distinct Substudies	13. Substudy Type	14. Principal Investigator	15. Appx. Budget
a. Stage I (Districts)	01	NA	$ 313 K
b. Stage II (Dist. Clusters)	01	NA	$ 217 K
c. Stage III (Synthesis)	01	NA	$ 60 K
d.			$
e.			$

Section II (Stage I: Districts)

16. Unit of Qualitative Study School District 17. No. of Units (C) 18
18. Modes of Field Research (C)
    a. 12 2 visits for 3-5 days per visit
    b. 6 1 visits for 3 days per visit
    c. - intermittant for ___ days over ___ mos.
    d. - continuous for ___ months
19. Structure of Field Research (C)
    a. - one person throughout
    b. - series of ___ sole persons
    c. 18 team of ___ persons
    d. - team of ___ persons
20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (R)
    a. 3 document acquisition
    b. - questionnaire administration
    c. - highly-structured interviewing
    d. 1.5 semi-structured interviewing
    e. 1.5 largely-unstructured interviewing
    f. - highly-structured observation
    g. 4.5 semi-structured observation
    h. 4.5 largely-unstructured observation
    i. ___
21. Number of Field Workers (C) 13
22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (C)
    a. - anthropology
    b. 13 education
    c. - political science
    d. - psychology
    e. - sociology
    f. ___
23. Types of Public Unit-specific Narratives (C)
    a. x none
    b. ___ brief vignettes
    c. ___ chapter-length case studies
    d. ___ book-length case studies
24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s):

Kennedy, Mary, Richard Apling and William Neumann. The Role of Evaluation and Test Information in Public Schools. Cambridge, MA: Huron Institute, August 1980.

PROJECT PROFILE

Section I

1. ID 22 2. Project Name Case Studies of Interorganizational Arrangements for Knowledge Utilization
3. Funding Agency NIE/DIP (Contract No. 400-79-0062)
4. Project Monitor a. Ward S. Mason Telephone (202) 254-6050
   b. _____ Telephone _____
5. Research Organization Abt Associates Inc.
   1521 New Hampshire Ave.
   Washington, D.C. 20036
6. Start 10/79 7. End 3/81
8. Duration 1.5 years
9. Total Budget $ 130 K
10. Project Director a. Robert Yin Telephone (202) 466-4343
    b. _____ Telephone _____
11. Overall Research Design a. X qualitative study(ies) only
    b. ___ separate qualitative and quantitative substudies
    c. ___ integrated qualitative and quantitative substudy(ies)

12. Name of Distinct Substudies	13. Substudy Type	14. Principal Investigator	15. Appx. Budget
a. (None)			$
b.			$
c.			$
d.			$
e.			$

Section II

16. Unit of Qualitative Study Inter-org. Arrangement 17. No. of Units (C) 3
18. Modes of Field Research (C)
    a. 3* 1 visits for 5 days per visit
    b. 3* 1 visits for 3 days per visit
    c. - intermittent for ___ days over ___ mos.
    d. - continuous for ___ months
19. Structure of Field Research (C)
    a. - one person throughout
    b. - series of ___ sole persons
    c. 3 team of 2 persons
    d. - team of ___ persons
20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (R)
    a. 1.5 document acquisition
    b. - questionnaire administration
    c. - highly-structured interviewing
    d. 1.5 semi-structured interviewing
    e. - largely-unstructured interviewing
    f. - highly-structured observation
    g. - semi-structured observation
    h. - largely-unstructured observation
    i. ___
21. Number of Field Workers (C) 3
22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (C) **
    a. - anthropology
    b. - education
    c. - political science
    d. 1 psychology
    e. 1 sociology
    f. 1 economics
23. Types of Public Unit-specific Narratives (C)
    a. ___ none
    b. 9 brief vignettes
    c. 3 chapter-length case studies
    d. - book-length case studies
24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s):

Yin, Robert and Margaret Gwaltney. Organizations Collaborating to Improve Educational Practice. Washington, D.C.: Abt Associates Inc., 1981, 135 pp.

* The initial visit of 5 days was the primary source of data. The second visit of 3 days was for the purpose of verifying the conclusions of the case study narratives.
** Major emphasis on the use of well-trained and experienced social scientists as field workers.

PROJECT PROFILE

Section I

1. ID 23 2. Project Name Case Studies of Interorganizational Arrangements for Knowledge Utilization Involving Colleges of Education
3. Funding Agency NIE/DIP (Contract No. NIE-79-0063)
4. Project Monitor a. Ward S. Mason Telephone (202) 254-6050
   b. _____ Telephone _____
5. Research Organization American University
   Knowledge Transfer Institute
   Washington, D.C. 20016
6. Start 10/79 7. End 3/81
8. Duration 1.7 years
9. Total Budget $ 107 K
10. Project Director a. Ronald Havelock Telephone (202) 686-3814
    b. Michael Huberman Telephone _____
11. Overall Research Design a. x qualitative study(ies) only
    b. ___ separate qualitative and quantitative substudies
    c. ___ integrated qualitative and quantitative substudy(ies)

12. Name of Distinct Substudies	13. Substudy Type	14. Principal Investigator	15. Appx. Budget
a. (None)			$
b.			$
c.			$
d.			$
e.			$

Section II

16. Unit of Qualitative Study Interorg. Arrangement 17. No. of Units (C) 3

18. Modes of Field Research (C)
    a. 3 3-9 visits for 1-3 days per visit
    b. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
    c. - intermittent for ___ days over ___ mos.
    d. - continuous for ___ months

19. Structure of Field Research (C)
    a. 3 one person throughout
    b. - series of ___ sole persons
    c. - team of ___ persons
    d. - team of ___ persons

20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (R)
    a. 2 document acquisition
    b. - questionnaire administration
    c. 1 highly-structured interviewing
    d. - semi-structured interviewing
    e. - largely-unstructured interviewing
    f. - highly-structured observation
    g. 3 semi-structured observation
    h. - largely-unstructured observation
    i. 4 logs of activities and contacts

21. Number of Field Workers (C) 3

22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (C)
    a. - anthropology
    b. - education
    c. - political science
    d. 2 psychology
    e. 1 sociology
    f. ___ _____

23. Types of Public Unit-specific Narratives (C)
    a. ___ none
    b. 15 brief vignettes (the "serials")
    c. 3 chapter-length case studies
    d. - book-length case studies

24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s):

Havelock, Ronald (with Pattie L. Cox, A. Michael Huberman & Annette Levinson) School-University Collaboration Supporting School Improvement, Vol. 4: Comparison and Synthesis of Three Cases. Washington, DC: Knowledge Transfer Institute, American University, 1982, 322 pp.

PROJECT PROFILE

Section I

Case Studies of Interorganizational Arrangements for

1. ID 24 2. Project Name Knowledge Utilization: University/School/Community Collabs.

3. Funding Agency NIE/DIP (Contract No. NIE- 79-0064)

4. Project Monitor a. Ward S. Mason Telephone (202) 254-6050

b. _____ Telephone _____

5. Research Organization TDR Associates Inc.
385 Eliot
Newton, MA

6. Start 10/79 7. End 4/81

8. Duration 1.6 years

9. Total Budget $ 100 K

10. Project Director a. Robert Chin Telephone (617) 969-0651

b. _____ Telephone _____

11. Overall Research Design a. x qualitative study(ies) only
b. ___ separate qualitative and quantitative substudies
c. ___ integrated qualitative and quantitative substudy(ies)

12. Name of Distinct Substudies	13. Substudy Type	14. Principal Investigator	15. Appx. Budget
a. (None)			$
b.			$
c.			$
d.			$
e.			$

Section II

16. Unit of Qualitative Study Event/Project* 17. No. of Units (C) 12

18. Modes of Field Research (C)
a. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
b. - ___ visits for ___ days per visit
c. 12 intermittent for 6 days over 7 mos.
d. ___ continuous for ___ months

19. Structure of Field Research (C)
a. 12 one person throughout
b. - series of ___ sole persons
c. - team of ___ persons
d. - team of ___ persons

20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (R)
a. 3 document acquisition
b. - questionnaire administration
c. - highly-structured interviewing
d. 1 semi-structured interviewing
e. - largely-unstructured interviewing
f. - highly-structured observation
g. 2 semi-structured observation
h. - largely-unstructured observation
i. ___ _____

21. Number of Field Workers (C) 4

22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (C)
a. - anthropology
b. 1 education
c. - political science
d. 1 psychology
e. 2 sociology
f. ___ _____

23. Types of Public Unit-specific Narratives (C)
a. ___ none
b. 12 brief vignettes
c. 3 chapter-length case studies
d. - book-length case studies

24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s):

TDR Associates Inc. Case Studies of Three Urban University-School Collaborations Mandated for the Improvement of Educational Practice, Vols. I & II. Newton, MA: The author, 1981, 219 pp. & 271 pp.

* The "event/project" was the most basic unit of qualitative study. For purposes of analysis separate cross-unit syntheses were conducted within each of 3 college/school collaboratives and within the single school district associated with them.

PROJECT PROFILE

Section I

A Descriptive Study of Significant Bilingual Instructional Features

1. ID 25 2. Project Name

3. Funding Agency NIE (Part C Res. Agenda for Bilingual Ed.) Contract No. NIE-R-80-0026)

4. Project Monitor a. Edward Fuentes Telephone (202) 254-5407
b. Telephone

5. Research Organization Far West Laboratory, 1855 Folsom Street, San Francisco, CA 94103

6. Start 9/80 7. End 9/83

8. Duration 3.0 years

9. Total Budget $ 2.7 M

10. Project Director a. William Tikunoff Telephone (415) 565-3000
b. Telephone

11. Overall Research Design a. __ qualitative study(ies) only
b. __ separate qualitative and quantitative substudies
c. x integrated qualitative and quantitative ~~xxx~~study~~xxx~~

12. Name of Distinct Substudies | 13. Substudy Type | 14. Principal Investigator | 15. Appx. Budget

a. Year 1	Q1/Qn	NA	$1.1 M
b. Year 2	Qn/Q1	NA	$1.4 M
c. Year 3	Q1=Qn	NA	$ .3 M
d.			$
e.			$

Section II (Year 1)

16. Unit of Qualitative Study Ethno-linguistic Group 17. No. of Units (C) 6*

18. Modes of Field Research (C)
a. - __ visits for __ days per visit
b. - __ visits for __ days per visit
c. - intermittent for __ days over __ mos.
d. 6 continuous for 8 months ***

19. Structure of Field Research (C)
a. - one person throughout
b. - series of __ sole persons
c. 6 team of 3-5 persons
d. - team of __ persons

20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (R)
a. 5 document acquisition
b. - questionnaire administration
c. - highly-structured interviewing
d. 4 semi-structured interviewing
e. 6 largely-unstructured interviewing
f. 1 highly-structured observation
g. 2.5 semi-structured observation
h. 2.5 largely-unstructured observation
i. __

21. Number of Field Workers (C) 24

22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (C)
a. - anthropology
b. - education
c. - political science
d. - psychology
e. - sociology
f. 24 MA

23. Types of Public Unit-specific Narratives (C)
a. __ none
b. - brief vignettes
c. - chapter-length case studies
d. 6 book-length case studies **

24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s):
Tikunoff, William J. An Emerging Description of Successful Bilingual Instruction: An Update on the SBIF Descriptive Study. San Francisco, CA: Far West Lab., 1982.

* The Year 2 study included two additional sites.
**In addition to these book-lenght cases studies of each site there were nine book-lenght case studies of instruction using the classroom as the unit of analysis.
***The Year 2 study continued the field work for an additional 8 months.

APPENDIX B. EXPLANATORY NOTES FOR THE PROJECT PROFILES

Presented below are a series of notes helpful in understanding the multisite qualitative project profiles presented in Appendix A. These notes elaborate the short titles for each item found on the profile sheets and offer definitions for all key terms used on those sheets. In addition they clarify those instances in which the numerical "score" for a particular item represents a count (indicated by a "C" after the item title--cf., item 18) and those in which it represents a rank (indicated by an "R" after the item title--cf., item 20).

Section I of each profile presents information about a project irrespective of its substudy organization or the various units of qualitative study it may contain. In Section II descriptive data are presented for either the entire project (if it consists of a single qualitative study) or for only a major qualitative substudy (if the project consists of two or more substudies).

SECTION I. PROJECT SPECIFIC DATA

1. ID

A nominal code number for each project, running in sequence from the earliest funded (01) to the latest funded (25) project.

2. Project Name

The name the project is most widely known by. In general this is not the formal project title associated with the contract document.

3. Funding Agency

The agency most directly responsible for the funding and monitoring of the research. (See Appendix A, Table A-1 for a glossary of funding agency abbreviations.)

4. Project Monitor

The federal official most directly responsible for overseeing the technical aspects of the research. If there was more than one monitor, unless otherwise noted the first one is reported on line "a" and the last on line "b."

5. Research Organization

The organization awarded the contract (or occasionally subcontract) to carry out the research.

6. Start Date

The month and year in which the project began.

7. End Date

The month and year in which the project (including all follow-ons and refundings) officially terminated or (in the case of ongoing projects) is due to terminate.

8. Duration

The duration (or expected duration) of the project in years.

9. Total Budget

The project's total budget, including all follow-ons and refundings. The abbreviation "K" signifies thousands and "M" millions.

10. Project Director

The person within the research organization (item 5) most responsible for the technical direction of the project. If there was more than one such person during the life of the project, unless otherwise noted the first incumbent is reported on line "a" and the last on line "b."

11. Overall Research Design

This item reports the relationship (if any) of the multisite qualitative activities within the project to other project activities. Qualitative studies are those involving on-site field work consisting of document acquisition, interview or observation. They may or may not involve the preparation of site-specific narratives (e.g., case studies) for each site. "Separate qualitative and quantitative studies" generally have distinct data bases and reports. "Integrated" qualitative and quantitative studies do not.

12. Name of Distinct Substudies

A brief descriptive name for each distinct substudy.

13. Substudy Type

Substudies are either primarily qualitative (Q1), primarily quantitative (Qn), a blend of qualitative and quantitative with the emphasis on the former (Q1/Qn), a blend of qualitative and quantitative with the emphasis on the latter (Qn/Q1), or an approximately equal blend of both (Q1=Qn).

14. Principal Investigator

The name of the one person on the project (other than the project director) who was most responsible for the technical direction of the substudy.

15. Approximate Budget

The approximate budget (including follow-ons and refundings) for the substudy. The abbreviation "K" signifies thousands and "M" millions.

SECTION II. DATA SPECIFIC TO A SINGLE UNIT OF QUALITATIVE STUDY

If the project contains no distinct substudies (see item 12) section II presents information about the entire project. If, however, the project contains distinct substudies section II reports on only the designated qualitative (or primarily qualitative) substudy.

16. Unit of Qualitative Study

The unit under study by qualitative means. Units are typically school districts, projects within school districts, schools, or projects within schools. Often the term research "site" is used as a synonym for "unit."

17. Number of Units

The total number of units (i.e., research sites) under investigation by the study/substudy.

18. Mode(s) of Field Research (counts of units)

This item distributes the units reported in item 17 according to three modes of field research varying in the temporal extensiveness of on-site presence. A "visit" involves no more than 14 consecutive days on site; it is usually made by persons living away from the site. "Intermittent" field research involves more frequent contact, generally by someone living within a day's commuting distance from the site and who is involved in research at that site on an on-going basis. "Continuous" field research involves doing at least one-half time research at each site, generally by persons residing at the site. The numbers presented are counts of units, and (unless otherwise noted) sum to the total number of units reported in item 17.

19. Structure of Field Research (counts of units)

This item distributes the units reported in item 17 according to different staffing arrangements. The numbers presented are counts of units and (unless otherwise noted) sum to the total number of units.

20. Techniques of Qualitative Data Collection (ranks)

This items presents a rank ordering of the degree of "importance" within the study/substudy of various techniques for the collection of qualitative data. The emphasis here is on data collection techniques which were built into the multisite study design and thus were intended to be utilized rather uniformly across all sites, as distinct from techniques which may have been employed at the discretion of field workers responsible for only some of the sites. Importance is considered in terms of the centrality of a given technique to the public products of the study, not in terms of how the budget was allocated. "Highly structured" techniques impose on the field workers a detailed set of stimuli to persue (e.g., issues to be addressed, phenomena to be observed, questions to be asked) as well as predefined sets of response alternatives (e.g., behavioral options, precoded answers). "Semi-structured" techniques impose predefined stimuli, but not predefined response options. "Largely unstructured" techniques impose neither detailed stimuli nor response options, although they generally imply some broad priorities regarding the classes of stimuli and of responses to be explored.

In general both highly structured and semi-structured techniques imply the existence of checklists or schedules of things for the field workers to ask about or observe, while unstructured techniques do not. Highly structured techniques imply the coding of data according to predefined categories while the data are being collected, whereas semi-structured and unstructued techniques do not. The numbers presented in item 20 are ranks for the various techniques in terms of their importance, with "1" signifying the greatest importance. Techniques that were seldom employed within a particular study/substudy have been left blank (i.e., unranked).

21. Number of Field Workers

This is the total number of persons within the study/substudy who had major responsibility for on-site data collection.

22. Major Disciplinary Identification of Field Workers (counts of field workers)

This item distributes the total number of field workers reported in item 21 according to their major disciplinary identification. In most cases such identification is the field in which a person holds his or her highest degree, but it could be a different field if a shift in disciplinary interest has occurred subsequent to the awarding of the highest degree. The numbers presented sum to the total number of field workers as reported in item 21.

23. Type of Public Unit-specific Narratives (counts of sites)

This item presents the emphasis within the study/substudy upon the presentation of public narratives (i.e., narratives intended to be read by persons beyond those working on the study) for specific sites. "Brief vignettes" are descriptive statements, abstracts or profiles of no more than approximately 20 double spaced pages. "Chapter-length case studies" are approximately 20-100 pages in length and provide a sense of what the site is like as a social or cultural system. "Book-length case studies" are over 100 pages in lenght and provide a deeper sense of social or cultural system. The numbers presented represent the number of sites for which each type of public narrative was prepared. They do not necessaryily sum to the total number of sites, since more than one type of public narrative could be prepared for some (or even all) sites. In addition there can be a "nesting" of narratives, with chapter-lenght case studies (e.g., of schools) being located within a series of book-length case studies (e.g., of school districts).

24. Facts of Publication of Most Informative Study Document(s)

The document(s) produced by the study/substudy which is (are) most informative about its multisite qualitative findings and how those findings were produced. In many instances these documents contain references to other (more specialized) study/substudy documents.

APPENDIX C. SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES FOR PART II

Presented below are ten tables prepared in exploring the inter-issue patterns discussed in Part II. Table C-1 presents the marginal frequencies for each of the four design-issue variables: 1) the predominant data collection approach, 2) the number of sites, 3) the degree of on-site presence, and 4) the analytic emphasis of report narrative. Tables C-2 thru C-7 display the six resulting two-variable associations. In only one instance (the number of sites by the analytic emphasis of report narrative) was a statistically significant association observed (see Table C-6).

In order to explore for possible higher-order patterns of associations, Table C-6 was used to define five distinguishable zero-order patterns, labeled A, B, C, D and E (see Table C-10). However, when these five patterns were related to the degree of on-site presence (Table C-8) and the predominant data collection approach (Table C-9), no statistically significant higher-order associations were observed.

Table C-1. Distribution of a Major Qualitative Study within 25 Federally Funded Policy Research Projects on each of Four Design Variables.

Design Variable	Number of Studies
A. The predominant data collection approach:	
Primarily semi-structured	14
Semi-structured with some unstructured	6
Primarily unstructured	5
B. The number of sites being studied:	
Three thru six	7
Eight thru twenty-two	13
Thirty thru sixty	5
C. The degree of on-site presence:	
One or two short visits	10
Several intermittent visits	7
Many repeated visits or continuous presence	8
D. Analytic emphasis of report narrative:	
Primarily site-specific	12
Primarily cross-site with some site-specific	3
Exclusively cross-site	10

Table C-2. Joint Distribution of the Degree of On-site Presence and the Number of Sites

Degree of On-site Presence	Number of Sites		
	3-6	8-22	30-60
One or two short visits	2	5	3
Several intermittent visits	1	6	0
Repeated visits or continuous presence	4	2	2

Chi-square = 6.7 (df = 4)

Table C-3. Joint Distribution of the Degree of On-site Presence and the Predominant Data Collection Approach

Degree of On-site Presence	Predominant Data Collection Approach		
	Primarily Semi-structured	Largely Semi-structured with some Unstructured	Primarily Unstructured
One or two short visits	7	2	1
Several intermittent visits	5	1	1
Many Repeated visits or continuous presence	2	3	3

Chi-square = 4.8 (df = 4)

Table C-4. Joint Distribution of the Degree of On-site Presence and the Emphasis of Report Narrative

Degree of On-site Presence	Analytic Emphasis of Report Narrative		
	Primarily Site-specific	Largely C-s with some S-s	Primarily Cross-site
One or two short visits	3	2	5
Several intermittent visits	4	0	3
Repeated visits or continuous presence	5	1	2

Chi-square = 3.2 (df = 4)

Table C-5. Joint Distribution of the Number of Sites and the Predominant Data Collection Approach

Number of Sites	Predominant Data Collection Approach		
	Primarily Semi-structured	Largely Semi-structured with some Unstructured	Primarily Unstructured
3- 6	5	1	1
8-22	7	3	3
30-60	2	2	1

Chi-square = 1.5 (df = 4)

Table C-6. Joint Distribution of the Number of Sites and the Emphasis of Report Narrative

Number of Sites	Analytic Emphasis of Report Narrative		
	Primarily Site-specific	Largely C-s with some S-s	Primarily Cross-site
3- 6	6	1	0
8-22	6	1	6
30-60	0	1	4

Chi-square = 9.9 (df = 4)

Table C-7. Joint Distribution of the Predominant Data Collection Approach and the Emphasis of Report Narrative

Predominant Data Collection Approach	Analytic Emphasis of Report Narrative		
	Primarily Site-specific	Largely C-s with some S-s	Primarily Cross-site
Primarily semi-structured	8	2	4
Largely semi-struct. some unstructured	0	1	5
Primarily unstructured	4	0	1

Chi-square = 8.7 (df = 4)

Table C-8. Joint Distribution of the Degree of On-site Presence and NS/RN Design Pattern

Degree of On-site Presence	NS/RN Design Pattern*				
	A	B	C	D	E
One or two short visits	2	0	1	4	3
Several intermittent visits	1	0	3	3	0
Repeated visits or continuous presence	3	1	2	0	2

Chi-square = 10.2 (df = 8)

* See Table C-10 for the operational definition of the five design patterns.

Table C-9. Joint Distribution of the Predominant Data Collection Approach and NS/RN Design Pattern

Predominant Data Collection Approach	NS/RN Design Pattern*				
	A	B	C	D	E
Primarily semi-structured	5	0	3	4	2
Largely semi-struct. some unstructured	0	1	0	3	2
Primarily unstructured	1	0	3	0	1

Chi-square = 12.8 (df = 8)

* See Table C-10 for the operational definition of the five design patterns.

Table C-10. Definition of the Number of Sites/Analytic Emphasis of Report Narrative (NS/RN) Design Patterns A, B, C, D & E.

Number of Sites	Analytic Emphasis of Report Narrative		
	Primarily Site-specific	Largely C-s with some S-s	Primarily Cross-site
3- 6	A	B	-
8-22	C	D	D
30-60	-	E	E

APPENDIX D. ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR PART III

The Rural Experimental Schools (RES) Study

A. Herriott, R.E. Federal initiatives and rural school improvement: Findings from the Experimental Schools Program. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates Inc., 1980, 36p. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 192 961)

An overview of the design and substances of the RES Study. Presents an annotated bibliography of the eight nonstandard book-lenght case studies and an informal cross-case synthesis of their major findings.

B. Herriott, R.E. & Gross, N. (Eds.). The dynamics of planned educational change: Case studies and analyses. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1979, 411p.

A presentation of five semi-standard chapter-lenght case studies along with the nonstandard cross-case analyses of five external experts.

C. Herriott, R.E. Tensions in research design and implementation: The Rural Experimental Schools Study. American Behavioral Scientist, 1982, 26(1), 23-44.

An account by the RES Study director of tensions in the process of its design and implemention. Focuses heavily on isssues involving the RES case studies and the interaction of qualitative and quantitative methodologies.

The Experienced Based-Career Education (EBCE) Study

D. Farrar, E., DeSanctis, J.E. & Cowden, P. The walls within: Work, experience and school reform. Cambridge, MA: The Huron Institute, 1980, 201p. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 203 193)

The first of a two-volume final report from the EBCE Study. Lucid qualitative description and analysis of schools as social systems, of the process of EBCE implementation, and of its early outcomes.

E. DeSanctis, J.E. & Stix, S.A. Federal policy and local effects: The implementation and institutionalization of Experienced-Based Career Education. Cambridge, MA: The Huron Institute, 1981, 125p. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 203 192)

The second final report volume. A mixture of qualitive and quantitative analysis, focusing primarily on the impact of external forces on local EBCE implementation and institutionalization.

F. Farrar, E., DeSanctis, J.E. & Cohen, D.K. Views from below: Implementation research in education. Teachers College Record, 1980, 81, 77-100.

An interpretation of the qualitative data in the light of three perspectives on implementation as a social phenomenon: implementation as a center-to-periphery process, implementation as a bilateral process, and implementation as evolution.

The Career Intern Program (CIP) Study

G. Tallmadge, G.K., Treadway, P.G. & Fetterman, D.M. Study of career intern program: Summary report. Mountain View, CA: RMC Research Corp., 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 206 840)

Summarizes results of all aspects of the CIP evaluation. Includes quantitative assessment of program outcomes, case histories of the four sites and analysis of program elements conducive to positive results based on qualitative data.

H. Fetterman, D.M. Study of the Career Intern Program: Final Report Task C. Program dynamics: Structure, function and interrelationships. Mountain View, CA: RMC Corp., 1981, 314 p. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 206 843)

Provides qualitative description of the Career Intern Program as it was implemented in four sites. Identifies program characteristics that facilitate and impede positive outcomes. Extensive use of field notes for both descriptive and analytic purposes. Presents chapter length case studies on selected topics.

I. Fetterman, D.M. Ethnography in educational research: The dynamics of diffusion, Educational Researcher, 1982, 11(3), 17-22, 29.

An examination of tensions within the CIP Study from a perspective emphasizing the interaction of two sociocultural systems, those associated with "ethnographic" and "quantitative" research methodologies. Contains citations to other CIP-related methodological discussions.

The Parental Involvement (PI) Study

J. The four substantive final report volumes are:

Robbins, A.E. & Dingler, D. Parents and federal education programs, Vol. 3: ESSA. Santa Monica, CA: System Development Corp., 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 218 785)

Cadena-Munoz, R. & Keesling, J.W. Parents and federal education programs, Vol. 4: Title VII. Santa Monica, CA: System Development Corp., 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 218 786)

Smith, A.G. & Nernberg, S. Parents and federal education programs, Vol. 5: Follow Through. Santa Monica, CA: System Development Corp., 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 218 787)

Melaragno, R., Lyons, P. & Sparks, M. Parents and federal education programs, Vol. 6: Title I. Santa Monica, CA: System Development Corp., 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 218 783)

Each volume uses qualitative data to describe five dimensions of parent involvement in federal programs and to identify causes and consequences of such involvement. Heavy emphasis on the use of charts comparing sites within a program on a series of dimensions derived from the field notes. Some narrative description through the selective use of vignettes. Each volume deals with from 12 to 16 districts participating in one of the four federal programs.

K. Lee, D.R., Keesling, J.W. & Melaragno, R.J. (Eds.). Parents and federal education programs, Vol. 7: Methodologies employed in the study of parental involvement. Santa Monica, CA: System Development Corp., 1981, 57 p. plus appendixes. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 218 789)

Describes the methodologies employed for both the survey and qualitative portions of the study. A special chapter deals with the strenghts and shortcomings of the qualitative methodologies employed in the study.

L. Smith, A.G. & Robbins, A.E. Structured ethnography: The Study of Parental Involvement. American Behavioral Scientist, 1982, 26(1), 45-61.

Describes in detail the procedures used to collect, reduce, analyze and report the PI Study data. Examines some of the tensions faced in the study's design and implementation.

The Dissemination Efforts in Supporting School Improvement (DESSI) Study

M. Huberman, A.M. & Miles, M.B. How school improvement works: A field study of 12 sites. Andover, MA: The Network, Inc., 1982, 525p.

Presents in great detail the methodology and findings of the DESSI qualitative study of school improvement efforts at the local level.

N. Huberman, A.M. & Crandall, D.P. Fitting words to numbers: Multisite/multimethod research in educational dissemination. American Behavioral Scientist, 1982, 26(1), 62-83.

Examines the DESSI qualitative study of school improvement efforts in the light of the larger project of which it was a part. Focuses on issues of validity, reliability, and completeness. Presents an overview of the DESSI Study's innovative approaches to the reduction and analysis of qualitative data.

O. Huberman, A.M. & Miles, M.B. Drawing valid meaning from qualitative data: Some techniques of data reduction and display. Quality and Quantity, 1983, 17, forthcoming.

Considers the utility of qualitative methods in efforts to produce useful generalizations. Presents illustrative examples of the DESSI Study's approach to the reduction, display and cross-site analysis of qualitative data.